Leslie, Charles

THE

CASE STATED,

Between the

CHURCH of *ROME*

AND THE

CHURCH of *ENGLAND*.

Wherein is Shewed,

That the *Doubt* and the *Danger* is in the Former, and the Certainty and Safety in the Latter *Communion*.

For their Rock is not as our Rock, even our Enemies themselves being Judges. Deut. xxxii. 31.

The Fifth Edition.

LONDON,
Printed for *George Strahan* at the *Golden Ball* over-against the *Royal Exchange*, *Cornhill*. 1714.

Leslie, Charles

CONTENTS.

How

CONCLUSION.

A CONVERSATION

Betwixt an

English Roman Catholick Nobleman,

AND A

GENTLEMAN

His FRIEND of the

Church of *ENGLAND.*

Lord. IT is hard that by your late Act of Parliament I must either lose my Estate or change my Religion.

Gentleman. I think your Lordship ought not to lose your Estate, till you have first considered how far your Conscience will allow you to Conform to what is required of you.

L. If I thought I could save my Soul in the Church of *England*, I would think my self obliged to preserve my Right and Posterity.

G. Pray, My Lord, what is there in the Communion of the Church of *England* should make you think your Soul in any Danger? Would there be any Hazard of your Soul if there were no Invocation of *Saints* that are Dead in the Publick Offices of the Church; No Pictures or Images of *God* to be seen there: No *Elevation* of the *Host*, which was but of late Years brought into the Church: No Prayers for Souls out of *Purgatory*: If the Publick *Prayers* were in the *vulgar Tongue*: And if the *Sacrament* were given in *both Kinds*? For these are all the differences you will find betwixt your *Publick Offices* and ours.

L. But I must keep in the Communion of the *Church*, else I think I cannot save my Soul.

G. Your Lordship means in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*.

(1) *L.* Yes, for she is the *Mother Church*, and Center of *Unity* to all other Churches, insomuch that who are not of her Communion, are out of the Pale of the *Catholick Church*.

G. My Lord, it is certain that *Jerusalem* was the *Mother Church*, where *Christ* first planted the Gospel, and Commanded that it should be thence propagated to all other Nations, as he himself said, *beginning at Jerusalem*, Luke

Luke xxiv. 47. And till after the Vision of the Sheet to St. *Peter*, Acts x. No *Gentile* was admitted, as it is said, *Acts* xi. 19. *Then travelled — Preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only.* So that the *Jewish Christian Church* was the only *Church* for some time, and she it was who Converted the *Gentile* Nations, and therefore was the *Mother Church* to them all.

And *Rome* was not the first *Gentile* Church, for *the Disciples were called Christians first in Antioch*, Acts xi. 26. And the *Greek* Church was before the *Latin*; the New Testament was wrote in *Greek* for their Use, therefore the *Greek* Church could not be the Daughter of the *Latin* Church, which was born after her.

(2.) *L.* But St. *Peter* having been Bishop of *Rome*, and Christ having Constituted him to be the *Head* of the *Catholick Church* throughout the whole World, the same must descend to his Successors the Bishops of *Rome*.

G. This will not make her the *Mother* Church. You may call her *Supreme*, *Absolute*, *Universal*, or what you please, any thing but the *Mother* Church, to which it is impossible she should have any Title.

In the Conversion of the *Gentiles* to *Christianity* one Man and one Nation, must receive the Faith before another, they were not all Converted on a Day. And as when one Man Converts another, so it is of Churches and Nations,

Nations; it gives the one no Superiority over the other, except that of Gratitude and Esteem, but nothing of Authority.

But whatever the Privilege of the Mother Church may be, if it can be Translated from the *Mother* to the *Daughter*, from one Church to another, from *Jerusalem* to *Antioch*, and thence to *Rome*, as you must be obliged to say; then it may be Translated from *Rome* also to some other Church, unless some positive Command of *Christ* can be produced, first to fix it at *Rome*, and then a Promise that it shall never thence be removed. But the *Church of Rome* is not once named in all the New Testament, unless she is meant by the *Church at Babylon*, 1 Pet. v. 13. Nor is there any Promise whatsoever made to her, or any the least Intimation of her being the *Head* of the *Churches*, the Standard and Center of *Unity* to them all. Strange! if that be the *Summa rei Christianæ*, as *Bellarmin* calls it (in the Preface to his Book *de Romano Pontifice*) the *Sumin and Foundation of the Christian Religion.*

And as silent are the *Scriptures* concerning the supposed *Universal Supremacy* of St. *Peter*, or that he ever was at *Rome*, or Bishop of *Rome*. Some after Writers have mentioned it; but that is far from such an *Universal Tradition* as is sufficient for the mighty Superstructure which is raised upon it. But let it be granted it signifies nothing, because all is founded upon some Words said to St. *Peter*, such as, *Thou art* Peter—*Feed my Sheep*—

&c.

&c, Which cannot be strained to such an *Universal Supremacy* as the *Popes* have claimed, nor were so understood in the Primitive Church. For which I refer your Lordship to a Book I know you value, and favoured me with the Perusal of it, the Learned Monsieur *du Pin* his *Traité de la Puissance Ecclesiastique & Temporelle*. Printed at *Paris*, 1707. where *p.* 495. to *p.* 501. and *p.* 754. to *p.* 765. you will find all these Texts urged for the Supremacy of St. *Peter*, answered in the same manner as is done by the *Protestant* Writers, and it is shewed how very Foreign they are from the Purpose intended.

And that the *Rock* upon which *Christ* said he would build His *Church* was not *Peter*, but the *Faith* which *Peter* then Confessed, your Lordship may see the current Sense of the *Fathers*, and consult at your leisure St. *Augustine*, de Verb. Dom. Ser. 13. *Nazianzen* de Vet. Testam. St. *Cyril*, de Trin, lib. 4. St. *Chrysostom*, Hom. 55. in Matth. St. *Ambrose*, Com. in Ephes. 2. *Hilary*, de Trin, lib, 2, cap, 6, And there are many others. *Matth.* xvi. 18.

But nothing that was said of St. *Peter* is so express for an *Universal Supremacy* as what St. *Paul* said of himself, 2 *Cor.* xi. 28. That *the Care of all the Churches* lay upon him. And again, 1 *Cor.* vii. 17. *So Ordain I in all Churches.* If such a *Decretal* could be produced of St. *Peter's*, I doubt not it would have been made use of towards proving his *Universal Supremacy*. In the *Acts of the Apostles* it is told that St.

Paul

Paul was at *Rome* Preaching the Gospel for two whole Years together, *Acts* xxviii. 30, 31. But not a word of St. *Peter's* being there. And as St. *PAUL* planted the Gospel at *Rome*, so he wrote to the Church there as his particular Charge, for says he, *Rom.* xi. 13. *I speak to you Gentiles, in as much as I am the Apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine Office.* But St. *Peter* was the Apostle of the *Jews*, they were his particular Charge; and he himself allowed *that the Gospel of the Uncircumcision was committed to* Paul, *as the Gospel of the Circumcision was to himself*, Gal. ii. 7, 8, 9. And accordingly he directed his Epistle to the *Jews* of the Dispersion who were *Strangers scattered throughout* Pontus, *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, *Asia*, and *Bithynia*. But he wrote not to the *Gentiles*, particularly not to *Rome*, which would seem strange if he had been Bishop of *Rome*, and that had been his Chief and Principal Charge. And St. *Paul's* both *withstanding him to the Face* before the whole Church of *Antioch*, in behalf of the *Gentiles* whom he had misled, *fearing them who were of the Circumcision*, shews the Care St. *Paul* took of those who were more particularly his Charge; and seems a Behaviour not very suitable to the Supreme *Head* of the *Church* both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, if St. *Paul* had known any thing of St. *Peter's* being so Constituted by Christ.

And as little had it become the other *Apostles* to *send* their *Soveraign* upon Business, as they sent *Peter* to *Samaria*, Acts. viii. 14.

But

But if, as some say, St. *Peter* was Bishop of the *Jewish* Converts at *Rome*, and St. *Paul* of the *Gentiles* there, St. *Paul* would have had a much greater Flock than St. *Peter*, and the Successors of St. *Paul*, and not of St. *Peter*, must have been *Bishops* there, because the Church of *Rome* is now, and has long been all of the *Gentiles*.

But the surest way to find out the Truth is by Fact, and not straining Expressions, which may have several Meanings. The Eastern Monarchs have used to give themselves mighty Titles, as Son of the Sun, and Brother of the Stars, and King of all the Kings of the Earth, *&c.* But will any believe, that any of them was the Universal Monarch for all this, contrary to plain Fact?

Pray, My Lord, let me ask you, do you think one could Write the History of a King, suppose of King *Charles* the 2d, and in all the History neither call him *King*, mention his Restoration, Coronation, or tell of one *Regal* Act ever he did, as calling a Parliament, or Presiding in it, Sending or Receiving an Ambassador, or Granting a Commission, *&c.* And so of a *Pope*, could his History be wrote without calling him *Pope*, or telling of one *Papal* Act of his?

L. No, it is impossible. For such an History could not be called the History of a *King*, or of a *Pope*.

G. Now, my Lord, let me apply this. We have the History of the *Acts of the Apostles*,

ſtles, in which S. *Peter* has a great ſhare, though not ſo much as St. *Paul*, and there is a *Council* mentioned wherein both of them were preſent; and there is not a Tittle of any Superiority of St. *Peter* over St. *Paul*, or any other of the Apoſtles, either in that *Council*, or any where elſe throughout that whole Hiſtory, which, as your Lordſhip has determined, is impoſſible if St. *Peter* had that Supremacy which the Popes have Claimed as his Succeſſors.

This is ſo Demonſtrative a Proof that the Writers on your ſide think it neceſſary for them to endeavour ſome Solution to it. But the Weakneſs of their Anſwer is a yet greater Confirmation on our Side. For they can find no other way to get ſome Superiority to St. *Peter* in this *Council* than to ſuppoſe that he opened it, becauſe, as they ſay, he ſpoke firſt, which would not infer the Supremacy they intend, if it were true; but it is plainly otherwiſe; for it is ſaid, *Acts* xv. 7. *And when there had been much diſputing*, Peter *roſe up and ſaid* —— Nor did he ſpeak laſt, for after he had done *Paul* and *Barnabas* declared the Converſion of the *Gentiles*, by their means, without putting them under the *Law*, which was the Point in Debate; and after they had held their Peace, St. *James* who was Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, where the *Council* was held, did, as Preſident, reſume what had been ſaid by St. *Peter* and others, and gave his definitive Sentence upon the whole, *Wherefore my Sentence is*—

And

And the Decree of the *Council* was drawn up in the Words of St. *James*. So that it is plain he closed the *Council*, whoever opened it or spoke first, which is not so material as to be told in this Account of that *Council*. But dismissing the *Council*, and putting an End to it seems of greater Authority. If what is said of St. *James* here had been said of St. *Peter*, I question not it would have been made use of as a full Proof of his *Supremacy*, and *Presiding* in that *Council*.

L. I must confess the History of the New Testament is very barren, as to Facts relating to the Authority of St. *Peter* over the other Apostles. We must depend upon the Texts before mentioned of *Feed my Sheep*, &c.

G. None of these Texts are so express as what I quoted of St. *Paul*. But if they were meant in that Extent for which you produced them, it is impossible but that must appear in the Facts of St. *Peter*, especially in the part he bore in that *Council* at *Jerusalem*. And *Facts* are the surest Explanation of *Words*.

We discourse now only of *Authority*, what *Authority* one Apostle had over another, for that is the Point wherein we are concerned. We speak not of their Gifts and Graces, and their Labours in propagating the Gospel, wherein one might be more Eminent and Successful than another, but this gave him no *Authority* over the others. And in this also St. *Paul* had the Preference, for *He laboured more abundantly than they all*, 1 Cor. xv. 10. And all the *Epistles* almost

almost are his, to the several *Churches*. And his *Miracles* and *Conversions* of *Infidels* take up a much greater part in the *Acts of the Apostles* than those of St. *Peter*.

I have said so much of this Matter, because the supposed *Supremacy* of St. *Peter*; his being at *Rome*, and Bishop of *Rome*, is the whole Foundation of that *Supremacy* claimed by the *Bishop* or *Church* of *Rome*.

And if that be so Essential a Point, and upon which the *Unity* of the *Church* depends, insomuch that without it there is no *Church* at all, according to the Scheme drawn by Modern *Rome*; it is inconceivable the *Scriptures* should be so wholly silent in it, nay, shewing the very contrary in Fact, as I have said already concerning St. *Peter*. And when the direct Question was put to our Blessed *Saviour*, upon the Contest among the *Apostles* which of them should be the Greatest, *Luke* xxii. 24. I say if this was so material a Point as to the very Being of the *Church*, it is inconceivable He should not have Determined it, but by His Answer rather checkt the Error of their Thought, and left them all upon the Level.

(3.) *L.* I would gladly know your Notion of the *Unity* of the *Church*, if all *Bishops*, as you say of the *Apostles*, were upon the Level, without any *Head Bishop*, or *Principle* of *Unity* among them; for we are told that *Christ* has but *one Church* upon *Earth*.

G. Your Lordship may add, and in *Heaven* too; for all are *one Church* to *Christ*, of which He alone is the *Head.* And one Part being *Militant*, the other *Triumphant*, makes them not two *Churches*, but two *States* of the same *Church*; which is called *One Family in Heaven and Earth.* Eph. iii. 15. In like Manner, *Heaven*, *Earth*, and *Hell* are one *Kingdom* to the Great *Creator*; for *His Kingdom ruleth over all.* And of the *Earth* it is said, *The Kingdom is the Lord's, and He is the Governor among the Nations*, Psal. xxii. 28. All the *Nations* are one *Kingdom* to Him. But he has appointed no *Universal* Monarch as His *Deputy* of his *Kingdom* of the *Earth*, but each *Nation* is Governed by their respective *Rulers*, independent of each other. For so His Wisdom has Disposed, according to the Capacity of his Creatures, for what Man would be sufficient to Govern the whole World? And where must the *Seat* be of this *Universal Monarch?* Must he not have as many or more *Deputies* under him as there are now *Kings* of *Nations?* And what Prudence could prevent Defections and Rebellions in far distant Provinces? This has overthrown great Monarchies, which have fallen with their own Weight. What then could support an *Universal Monarchy?* when *Nations* go to War, other Neighbour *Kings* and *States* may Interpose, assist the Oppressed, be *Mediators* and *Guarantees* of Peace. But this could not be in Case of Defection from the *Universal Monarch*, for who assist *Rebels* are *Rebels* themselves,

And such Wars could not but end in the utter Destruction of the one side or the other. Therefore God has Consulted best for the Peace and Safety of Mankind in Distributing the World into several Independent Governments, rather than to put all under the Dominion of One.

L. But when Nations are at *War*, where is the *Unity* of this one *Kingdom* of *God* upon *Earth*.

G. It is disturbed where those *Wars* are. But it is not yet totally Dissolved: For there are *Laws* of *War*, wherein all agree. There is still what we call the *Law of Nations*, which as it Maintains Commerce in *Peace*, so it regulates the Fury of *War*. And there is one *Unity* which nothing can Dissolve, that is, *God having made of one Blood all Nations upon the Earth*. So that here is an *Unity* of *Relation*, of *Humanity*, and of common *Principles* which all retain.

L. But how is this Unity kept?

G. Not as it should be. But so as is Consistent with our fallen State, and the Corruptions of Mankind. It is not such an *Unity* as is in God's Kingdom of *Heaven*; which yet was once Disturbed by *Rebellion*.

L. But there ought to be a stricter *Unity* in the *Church* than in the *Temporal* World?

G. I wish it were so, but alas it is not. And the Frailty of Man shews it self in the *Church* as well as in the *State*. The many *Heresies* and *Divisions* in the *Church* have rent her to pieces and broke her *Unity*, as much as *Wars* have that of the *Temporal* World.

L.

L. That is for not adhering to the *Head* and *Universal Monarch* of the *Church*.

G. No, my Lord, it is that Pretence in the Church of *Rome* has been the great Cause of these Divisions. It has procured *Peace* in the *Church*, just as setting up an *Universal Monarchy* would in the *World*, that is, fill it with more Confusion and Bloodshed than ever was in it, or could otherwise possibly be. For which reason God has appointed no *Universal Monarch* in the *Church* more than in the *State*. For as *Gregory* the Great said to *John* Bishop of *Constantinople* (who, upon the *Seat* of the *Empire* being Translated thither, set up for an *Universal Supremacy* in the *Church*) *If the Church should come to Depend upon One, it must suddenly fall.* And St. *Cyprian* said, *That therefore Christ made the College of Bishops numerous, that if one should fall or turn Heretical, the rest might interpose for the saving of the Flock*: For he says, there is but *one Flock, and one Episcopat*, of which every Bishop has the whole in Partnership with the rest. *Episcopatus Unus est, cujus à Singulis in Solidum pars tenetur.* This was the frame of the *Church* in his Days, and before from the Apostles; this was the very State of the *Apostles* themselves, who thus shared of the *Apostolat*; the whole of which was given to each, in Partnership, or in Common with the rest.

L. This then is your Notion of the *Church* that as all *Nations* upon the *Earth* are *One Kingdom* to *God*, so all *Christian Churches* are *One Church* to *Christ*, without any *Universal Mo-*

church in either Case. And that as the *Unity* of the *World* consists in what we call the *Law of Nations*, which is common to all; so the *Unity* of the *Church* consists in the common *Christianity* wherein all agree.

L. If so, then every one who Believeth in *Christ* is a *Christian*.

G. Yes surely, as every one that Believeth in *Mahomet* is a *Mahometan*.

L. Then there is no need to be of any *Church*, if you Believe in *Christ* that is enough.

G. No, we must obey His *Commandments* too, which oblige us to live Peaceably and Quietly as *Members* of that *Body* or *Church* whereto we appertain, with Christian Love and Fellowship with all others, and not to make *Schisms* and *Divisions* by breaking *Communion*, where nothing *Sinful* is required as a *Condition* of it. And when such Disorderly Persons are cast out of the *Church*, or cut themselves off by a Causeless *Separation*, though they are no longer of the *Church*, yet they cease not to be *Christians*; (that is a *Nostrum* of the Church of *Rome*) and they must Answer for their *Schism* as for other *Sins*, all of which are *Damnable* in their own Nature, without *Repentance*: And yet Allowances are made for Invincible *Ignorance* occasioned by the Prejudices of *Education*, &c. but not for *Obstinacy*. No *Society* of Men would bear such Perverse *Members* among them.

Now a *Church* is a *Society* professing such a *Religion*, be it True or False. Thus there is a *Church* of the *Jews*, of *Heathens*, of *Christians*,

ſtians, and *Mahometans*. And I would aſk your Lordſhip which is any of theſe *Churches*, for Inſtance, which is the *Church* of the *Mahometans*?

L. It is the *Turks*, *Moors*, *Perſians*, the Great *Mogul*, &c.

G. Yet there is no *Chief Prieſt* over all theſe, but every *Church* as *Nation* is Independant of each other. And thus among the ſeveral *Nations* and *Churches* of the *Heathens*. The *Jews* were but one *Nation*, and a ſmall one, therefore they had as one *King*, ſo one *High Prieſt*. There was ſomething like this in that part of the *Chriſtian Church* which was within the *Roman Empire*. But to extend the *Supremacy* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome* beyond the Limits of the *Emperor* of *Rome*, even to all the *Chriſtian Churches* in the World, is a Fancy never came into the Heads of any other Mortals, and is not neceſſary to Denominate many *Churches* profeſſing the ſame *Religion* to be one *Church*, as of the *Heathens* and *Mahometans*, all of which are called the *Heathen* or the *Mahometan Church* or *Churches*; without any common *Head* over them all. And there is not one word in *Scripture* appointing ſuch an *Univerſal Head* in the *Chriſtian Church*, or altering this common Sentiment of Mankind, as to the meaning of the word *Church*, or taking it in any other Senſe than commonly underſtood by all the World. And thus in our way of ſpeaking, when we ſay the *Fathers* of the *Church*, or the Primitive *Church*, we mean not any particular *Church*,

but the whole *Body* or *Church* of *Christians*, though divided into many *Nations* or *Churches*.

L. But all in Subordination to the *Church* of *Rome*.

G. What? Before there was a *Church* of *Rome!* For there were Christian *Churches* before, as I have told you. And after there was a *Church* at *Rome*, the Bishops and Fathers of those Times knew nothing of it's *Supremacy*, far less of it's *Infallibility*, nor ever Appealed to it in their Disputes with *Heretick*s, which had been the shortest and the surest way, and impossible to have been forgot, had it been known, and received as the Current *Faith*, or but *Opinion* of the *Church*. But on the contrary, other *Churches* have Contended with that of *Rome*, and Asserted their own Liberties and Independency upon her, when her Encroachments began to arise and disturb the *Peace* and *Unity* of the *Church*, which I shall shew you presently. But this is only to let you see, That the *Unity* of the *Church* was then understood, not as being *United* under any one Supreme *Bishop* or *Church*; but in the Concord and good Agreement of the several *Churches* among themselves, and in the *Unity* of the Common *Faith*. Which *Unity* is Described by their all having *One Lord*, *One Faith*, *One Baptism*, and *One Spirit*, from which they are called *one Body*. The *Unity of the Spirit* is their *Unity* with *God*, and the *Bond of Peace* is the *Unity* of the *Churches* with each other, as Members of

Eph. iv. 3, 4, 5.

of the same *Body*. And this is a much stricter and closer *Union* than that of the *Secular World*. All *Churches* agree in that Summary of our *Faith* called the *Apostles Creed*. And the Church of *Rome* her self must think this sufficient for Salvation, because she requires no other Profession of *Faith* in *Baptism*, or for being admitted into the *Church*. But the Twelve new *Articles* of *Faith* which the Council of *Trent* has added to the Twelve of the Apostles, which we call Pope *Pius* his *Creed*, and is required to be Professed by Converts, has made many Contests and Divisions in the *Church*; and I have not yet met with any *Roman Catholick* so hardy as to say, that the Belief of all these is necessary to Salvation, only that we should not deny or oppose them, such as *Purgatory*, the *Invocation of Saints*, &c.

(4) *L.* The *Church* pretends not to make *new Articles of Faith*, but only to explain the *old ones*. And such are what you call the *new Articles* of *Trent*.

G. What *Article* in the *Apostles Creed* does *Transubstantiation* explain? For there is nothing at all of the *Sacraments* in that *Creed*.

L. Are not the *Sacraments* then part of our *Faith*?

G. They are the *Signs* and *Seals* of our *Faith* as *Circumcision* was called, *Rom.* iv. 11. but not the *Faith* it self, and therefore are not put into that Summary of our *Faith*.

L. But are they not necessary to Salvation?

G. They are *generally Necessary*, as our *Catechism* words it, that is, to be Reverendly used when they may be had: But they are not *absolutely Necessary*, so that if our Circumstances, or Places where we live are such as not to afford us the Opportunity of Receiving the *Sacraments*, we should be *Damned* for want of them. I think none will say this. They are *Means* of *God*'s Appointment, therefore to be used, when we can have them; we are tyed to this, but *God* is not tyed to those *Means* to which He ties us. He can save without them.

L. But we have seven *Sacraments*, and you have but two.

G. That is, we take the word *Sacrament* in a stricter Sense than you do. And of the five which you have more than we, you cannot say that they are so much as *generally Necessary* to Salvation, because none can partake of them all, for your Sacrament of *Orders* excludes all the *Laity*, and that of *Marriage* the *Clergy*.

(5.) *L.* It is a sad thing that the *Church* should be Divided about these Matters. But we are all one, you are miserably Divided. How many *Sects* or *Churches* are there among you?

G. Not so many as with you.

L. How can that be? We have but one *Church* which we own as ſuch.

G. If a *Church* is anſwerable for all that break off from her, then you have all theſe *Sects* to reckon for, and us too, which is one more.

L. A *Church* is not anſwerable for thoſe who Break off from her, becauſe they are no longer of her.

G. Then we are not anſwerable for theſe *Sects* which Break off from our *Church*.

L. But we are all one among our ſelves.

G. So is every *Church* or *Sect*, that is, *thoſe* who agree among themſelves, do agree! So that this is no more a Mark of *Unity* than every *Diviſion* of Men can plead, and every *Sect*.

(6.) *L.* But we are the great Body of Chriſtians from which all broke off.

G. No, my Lord, not the half, or ever were; The Greek Church is an Elder Church than yours, ſo that you rather broke off from her, by ſetting up your *Univerſal Supremacy*; which ſhe never owned, nor the many other numerous Churches in *Aſia*; nor the Great and once Famous Churches in *Africa*; nor the Empire of *Ruſſia* of vaſt Extent in *Europe*, once a part of the Greek Church. Theſe never owned the *Supremacy* of *Rome*, and by far out-number all that ever did own it, or were of her Communion as ſuch. And conſidering how many Kingdoms and Nations have broke off from her ſince the *Reformation*, her Communion is now reduced to a very ſmall part of the *Chriſtian Church*,

Church, in Comparison of those who differ from her.

L. But those other *Churches* do not all Communicate with each other.

G. Nor *Rome* with any of them. So that she stands by her self, as other *Churches* do. And the most Irreconcilable of any, because by her Principles she cannot Communicate with any who will not own her *Supremacy*. Which as it never was done by the greatest Part of the *Catholick Church*, so there is little appearance that ever it will be; for it is observable that no *Nation* which broke off from *Rome* did ever Return to her again. It is a hard matter for one that has Escaped out of a Snare, to be Inviegled thither again. So that it is very visible *Rome* has been upon the losing hand about this 200 Years past. And that not only as to those who have quite forsaken her, but as to the Change of Principles and Lowring her *Supremacy* and *Infallibility* amongst those who still remain in her Communion, which I shall shew your Lordship presently, and that Old and New Popery are very different things, and that *Rome* it self has in some measure been Reformed by our *Reformation*.

I know nothing should hinder me from Communicating with the Greek Church, if I were there, while nothing *Sinful* were Required of me as a *Condition* of *Communion*, nor new *Creeds* to be imposed on me: And so of the *Churches* of St. *Thomas*, the *Jacobites*, and others in the East of *Asia*; of whom we have very Imperfect and uncertain Accounts: And so of the *Abyssines*,

nes, the *Coptics*, and other *Churches* in *Africa*. The great *Church* of *Russia* in *Europe*, &c. But *Rome*, while she pretends to *Universal Supremacy*, can Communicate with none but with her Self. So that our Communion is much more Extended or Extendable than that of *Rome*. And this *Universal Supremacy* is that which, most of any one thing in the World, hinders the *Union* and *Communion* of *Christian Churches*.

(7.) *L.* But though one *Church* may be *Supreme*, yet the best part of the Roman Catholicks place not the *Infallibility* there, but in a *General* or *Oecumenical Council* where all *Churches* meet.

G. There never was such a *Council*. The *Roman Empire* had the Vanity to call it self the *Oikumene*, which we translate, *All the World*, Luke 2. 1. Hence the *Councils* called within that *Empire* Stiled themselves *Oecumenical*, but no more truly so, than the *Roman Empire* was *All the World*. But the *Latin* Church was not so much as the *Oikumene* of the *Empire*, for *Greece* and other Parts of the *Greek* Church in *Asia* were in it, especially after the Seat of the Empire was translated to *Constantinople*, when they contended with *Rome* for the *Supremacy*. And the *Latin* Church was not then called by the Name of the *Church* of *Rome*, as the Learned *du Pin* says in his *Traité de la Puissance Ecclesiastique*, &c. *p.* 551. *It is true* (says he) *that at present the Name of the Church of* Rome *is given to the Catholick Church, and that these two Terms pass for Synonimous. But in Antiquity no more was intended*

led by the Name of the Church of Rome, *than the Church of the City of* Rome, *and the Popes in their Subscriptions or Superscriptions took simply the Quality of Bishops of* Rome. *The Greek Schismaticks seem to be the first who gave the Name of the Church of* Rome, *to all the Churches of the West; whence the Latins made use of this to distinguish the Churches which Communicated with the Church of* Rome, *from the Greeks who were separated from her Communion. From this came the Custom to give the Name of the Church of* Rome *to the Catholick Church. But the other Churches did not for this lose their Name, or their Authority*, &c. Then he goes on to Vindicate the Rights of every National Church, independent of the Church of *Rome*, and past her Power to Controul or Alter. And the *Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris, *p.* 45, 46. *Appendix*, tells the *Pope* that his *Bishoprick* extends only to the *Diocess* of *Rome*, and his *Patriarchat* to those Provinces called *Suburbicarian*. And that by taking upon him to Excommunicate others Unjustly, and where his Power did not reach, he had Excommunicated himself. And then he was so far from being *Head*, that he was not so much a *Member* of the *Church*. And they mind him, as likewise *du Pin* in the Treatise before mentioned *p.* 263. of the Stout Resistance made by the Bishops of *France* to the Pope who threatned to Excommunicate all of them that would not submit to his Decision; but they resolutely answered, That they would not submit to his Will, and that if he came there to

Excom-

Excommunicate them, he should go back Excommunicated himself. *Si Excommunicaturus veniret, Excommunicatus abiret.* Now what is that *Head* can be Excommunicated by its *Members*? What is that *Supremacy* can be Limited and Controuled by its *Subjects*, and of which they are the Judges, and can say to it, as God to the Sea, *Hitherto shalt thou come and no farther, here shall thy proud Waves be Stayed?*

(8.) L. The Church of *France* place the absolute *Supremacy* and the *Infallibility*, not in the *Pope* or *Church of Rome*, but in a *General Council.*

G. Which, as I told you, never was, and it is next to impossible ever should be.

And this gives up your whole Foundation for the *Popes* and not *Councils* pretend to be the Successors of St. *Peter*, and Heirs of all the Promises made to him.

In the next place, you are not Agreed among your selves concerning General Councils. *Bellarmin* (*de Concil.* l. 1. c. 6.) gives a list of *General Councils* which are to be Rejected, *Concilia Generalia reprobata*, some for not being Approved by the *Pope*, some for *Heresy*, and some (he might have said All) as not being Received by the *Universal Church*, but he meant only the *Church* of *Rome*. And *chap.* 7. is of *General Councils*, partly *Confirmed*, and partly *Reprobated*. And *chap.* 8. is of a *General Council* neither *Manifestly Approved*, nor *Manifestly Rejected*. This is going through all the Degrees of *Uncertainty*. And *c.* 5. and *de Rom. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 11. he says, The several things in those *Councils* allowed to be *General* were foisted in by *Heretics*, he knows not how. This was to get rid of some Objections against these *Coun-*

cils

cils he could not Answer otherwise. And (*de Eccles. Milit. c.* 16.) he Quotes the last Council of *Lateran* Condemning the Council of *Basil*, which he says was at first a true Œcumenical Council, and Infallible, but afterwards turned to a *Schismatical Conventicle*, and was of no Authority at all. The Church of *France* receive the Councils of *Basil* and *Constance* wholly and throughout: But the Church of *Rome* reject both in part. So that they who place the *Infallibility* in *Councils*, will need another *Infallible Judge* to determin these Disputes concerning the *Councils*; which are truly *General*, and which not; and which are *partly* so, and which *throughout*; and what *Part* of those that are *throughout* have been Corrupted by *Heretics*, if that can be called true *throughout* which is *Corrupted* in any Part. And when one *Council* condemns another, which shall we Believe? And if we must not believe every *Council* that calls it self *Oecumenical*, we can believe no other *Council* against it, for the same Reason. The *Second Council* of *Ephesus* is generally Condemned in your *Church*; yet it called it self *Oecumenical*, and was as much so as any of the others. And what a thing is it to say, that a *Council* is partly *right* and partly *wrong*? And who is judge of that? Is there any *Certainty* in this, far less *Infallibility*? And we must have an Infallible *Method* too to preserve the *Acts* of these *Councils*, that they be not *Adulterated*, as *Bellarmin* says they have been; and they continue so to this day in the Volumes of their *Councils*. Why then are they

not

not Amended, and these *Suppositions* and *Adulterated* parts (these are *Bellarmin*'s own Words) struck out? But the several *Editions* of their *Councils* are in the Hands of other *Churches*, and therefore they can make no Alteration in them without being Detected.

So that the Scheme of the *Infallibility* you place in your *Councils* stands thus; the *Church* of *Rome* makes her self the *Universal* or *Catholick Church*, insomuch that all who are not of her Communion (which are by far the greatest part of the *Christian Churches* in the World) are out of the Pale of the *Catholick Church*: And *Schismaticks* and *Hereticks* are no Parts of a *Catholick Council*: Thus a small part of the *Latin Church* (exclusive of the *Greek* and all other *Churches*) are the whole *Catholick Church*, and these little *Party Councils*, under the Direction of the *Pope*, are *Universal* and *Infallible*! But, as is shewn, the Church of *Rome* has no Right to the Title of the *Latin* Church it self, far less of the *Universal*. And she has now but a small part of the *Latin* Church left her. The *Reformed*, with *Russia*, and the *Greek* Church, will out-number her in *Europe*, and she has no *National Church* in her Communion any-where else.

L. But there are some of her Communion in most Countries.

G. Not so many as of the *Jews*, who by this are more *Universal* than your *Church*, and so more *Catholick*. And none of the Scattered *Seminaries* of *Rome* in other *Christian Churches* can be said to Represent those *Churches* in a *General*

Council,

Council, more than two or three Titular *Popish Bishops* in *England* could Represent the *Church* of *England* as it now stands. But, on the contrary, their living in a separate Communion in other *Christian Churches*, shews those *Churches* not to be of their *Communion*; and therefore cannot be Represented in any of their *Councils*. And these calling themselves *Oecumenical*, as the *Roman Empire* did, shews only how little Criticisms upon Words will avail against plain Matter of Fact; which I have shewed to be the Case as to those Texts urged for the Supremacy of St. *Peter*. And that if *Words* would do it, there are more, nay and *Facts* too, for the *Universal Supremacy* of St. *Paul*, at least over all the Christian Churches of the *Gentiles*, which are all now in the World.

(9.) *L.* But there must be an *Infallibility* some where in the *Church*, and if it be neither in *Pope* nor *Council*, or that as you say, there never was, nor well can be a *General Council*, truly so called, that is, of all the *Churches* in the World, where do you place the *Infallibility*?

G. No where, my Lord, nor can it be among Men who are all *Fallible*.

L. We trust not in Men, as Men, but Assisted by the Infallible *Spirit of God*. And this He has Promised shall never depart from His *Church*, as He has said, *Isa.* lix. 21. *My Spirit that is upon thee, and my Words which I have put in thy Mouth, shall not depart out of thy Mouth, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seed, nor out of the Mouth of thy Seeds Seed, saith the Lord*,

Lord, from henceforth and for ever. And He has said, *that the Priests lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his Mouth, for he is the Messenger of the Lord of Hosts.* Mal. ii. 7.

G. Read the next Words, *But ye are departed out of the way: ye have caused many to stumble at the Law: ye have corrupted the Covenant of* Levi, *saith the Lord.* The first is what they should or ought to have done, the second is what they did do, which was quite contrary.

And notwithstanding the Promise made in the first Text you quoted, yet *they were all gone out of the way, they were together become abominable, there was none that did good, no not one.—that all the World might become guilty before God,* as well the *Church* as the rest of the World. *Rom.* iii. 12, 19. And of the *Church* it is said, *The whole Head is sick, and the whole Heart faint: from the sole of the foot even unto the Head, there is no Soundness in it, but Wounds and Bruises and putrifying Sores.* Isa. i. 5, 6. And God says, *Mine Heritage is unto me as a Lion in the forest, it cryeth out against me, therefore have I hated it; Mine Heritage is unto me as a speckled bird*—&c. Jer. xii. 8, 9.

And we have now long since seen that *Church* of the *Jews*, to whom these Promises were made, quite thrown off, and the *Church* of the *Gentiles* come in its place.

L. These Promises were ultimatly intended to the *Christian* Church.

G. But they were first given to the *Jewish* Church, and belong even literally to her, and much more unconteſtably than to the Church of *Rome*, to whom no Promiſe whatſoever was made: Nor has ſhe any other Pretence to the Promiſes made to the Church in General, than her ſuppoſed *Supremacy* over all other Chriſtian Churches; which is diſputed with her, and Denyed by the other Churches. But there was none to Diſpute it with the *Jewiſh* Church, for ſhe was then the only *viſible Church* of *God* upon *Earth*. And if the Promiſes made to her, can fail, in vain does the Church of *Rome*, or even the whole *Gentile* Church claim theſe Promiſes as indefeaſible and unalterable to Her: For if the Promiſes made to the whole Church of God upon Earth can fail at one time, they may likewiſe at another, and there can be no Certainty.

L. Can the Promiſes of God then fail?

G. No, that is impoſſible, but we may miſtake his Promiſes and not underſtand them aright. And we may not perform the Conditions required.

L. But the Promiſes made to the Church (that particularly which I have named of *Iſa.* lix. 21.) are *Poſitive* and *Unconditional.*

G. But there is ſtill a *Condition* implyed, that is, of our *Obedience*; which our Saviour has fully Exemplified in the Parable of the Huſbandmen who did not render the Fruits of the Vineyard. As Treaſon forfeits an Eſtate or Honours given by a Prince, though in never

ver so positive Terms, and without any Condition expressed, but that of *Allegiance* to the *Prince* is always implyed. And thus the Church may forfeit her Charter. God said to *Eli* the High-Priest of the Jewish Church, *I said indeed that thy House and the House of thy Father should walk before me for ever; but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me; for them that Honour me I will Honour, and they that Despise me shall be lightly esteemed*, 1 Sam. ii. 30. And He said, Num. xiv. 34. *Ye shall know my breach of Promise*, or as our Margin reads it, *the altering of my Purpose*. And He has told us plainly that we are thus to understand his Promises as well as Threatnings, *Jer.* xviii. 7. &c. *At what instant I shall speak concerning a Nation* (or a Church) *to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that Nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their Evil, I will repent of the Evil I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a Nation* (or Church) *to build and to plant it, if it do Evil in my sight, that it obey not my Voice, then will I repent of the Good wherewith I said I would benefit them.*

This was the Language of the Prophets to the Jewish Church. But she understood it not, and leant upon the Promises made to her as Unconditional and Indefeasible, let her be as wicked as she would. And this hardned her against her *Prophets*, whom she persecuted for this reason as Enemies to the *Church*, as you find, *Jer.* xviii. 18. *Come and let us devise*

Devices against Jeremiah, for the Law shall not perish from the Priest. Here the *Jewish* Church stuck, and here the Church of *Rome* sticks at this Day.

H. But the *Gentile* Church cannot fail like the *Jewish*, for then there would be no *Church* at all.

G. The Apostle of the *Gentiles* says to the *Gentile* Church, *Thou also shalt be cut off, if thou continue not in the Goodness of God.* And that the *Jews*, *if they abide not still in Unbelief, shall be graffed in*, *for God is able to graff them in again*, Rom. xi. 22, 23. This shews that all the Promises made either to the *Jewish* or the *Gentile* Church are conditional, *viz. If they continue in the Goodness of God: Otherwise*, says St. *Paul* to the *Gentile Church*, *Thou also shalt be cut off*; and of all the *Gentile* Churches this was said more particularly to the Church of *Rome*, for this is in the Epistle wrote to Her, and to Her it was said, *Thou also shalt be cut off.*

And of the *Church* in General, whether *Jewish* or *Gentile*, it is said, *Luke* xviii. 8. *When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find Faith upon the Earth?* Where will then that *Visibility* be which *Rome* boasts of as an essential Mark of the true Church?

L. The *Church* is compared to a *City* set upon a *Hill*, to a *Candle* giving Light to all that are in the House. This is to shew her *Visibility.*

G. She

G. She is likewise compared to a *Woman* persecuted into a *Wilderness*, *Rev.* xii. 6. to a Lodge in a Garden of *Cucumbers*, to a *besieged City*. Isa. i. 8. And lastly, that she will be so little *Visible*, as that *Faith* shall hardly be found upon the *Earth*. This is not to be Reconciled but of different States of the *Church*, and at different times.

I. Christ says, *Eph.* v. 27. that *His Church is Glorious not having Spot or Wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be Holy and without Blemish.* And He calls her His *Beloved*.

G. So God called the Church of the Jews, *Jer.* xii. 7. *The dearly Beloved of His Soul.* Yet says, He had *forsaken* her for her Wickedness, and *hated* her. And *Isaiah* represents her as most filthy and corrupted, *chap.* i. 4, 5, 6.

The *Church* is called *Holy* and *Beloved* because of God's *Covenant* with her to be His *Holy* and *Beloved*, which will be hereafter in those that are perfected; when the *Tares* and the *Wheat* shall be separated, but they must grow together till then, when *Christ shall gather out of His Kingdom all things that offend, and them which do Iniquity.* Mat. xiii. 41. Then, and not till then, will the Church be all *Glorious, without Spot or Wrinkle*, &c. As the Text says, *Eph.* v. 25. *Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it — that He might present it to Himself a Glorious Church not having Spot or Wrinkle*, &c. But He has not yet so presented it. That time is not come. She is still in her *cleansing* State, but not yet thorough-

ly *cleansed.* And the *Scripture* speaks of both these *States* of the *Church*, but when we distinguish not, and would apply to the most *corrupt* State what is said of the most *Glorious*, We must needs fall into many Errors and Mistakes.

This is the Difficulty under which the Church of *Rome* now labours, She first making her self *the Catholick Church*: And then applying to her self, in this her *corrupt* State, whatever is said of the *Church* even in her *Perfect*, *Glorious*, and *Triumphant* State; creates her infinite Trouble, and endless Distinctions, to reconcile these; which is as impossible to be done as to make the State of the *Church* in *Heaven* and upon the *Earth* to be the same: And while the Corruptions in the Church of *Rome* are confessed and lamented by the most Learned and most Pious in her own Communion.

And she may as well maintain her *Impeccability*, as her *Infallibility*; for Sin is the greatest *Error*: And therefore I think nothing can be *Infallible*, but what is likewise *Impeccable*.

(10.) *L.* The Apostles were *Infallible*, but not *Impeccable*.

G. As much the one as the other. St. *Peter* Erred, and *Walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel.* And *many were carried away with his Dissimulation.* Gal. ii. 13, 14. And St. *Paul* owned that in some cases he *had no Commandment of the Lord*, only *gave his Judgment*, as a private Person, and *spoke by permission, and not*

of

of Commandment. But in other Cases he says, *I command, yet not I but the Lord—And to the rest speak I, not the Lord.* And it is so, *after my Judgment; and I think also that I have the Spirit of God.* 1 Cor. vii. 6, 10, 12, 25, 40. And no doubt great Deference was paid to his Judgment, as being an inspired Person, but not infallible in every thing, as he himself said. The Apostles were enabled to work many and great Miracles, which gave them full Credence as to what they delivered for Christian Doctrine. But this was no Personal nor Universal Infallibility.

(11) *L.* The Church of *Rome* has her *Miracles* too.

G. What! Both true and false? Can both come from God?

L. I know you deny our *Miracles.*

G. And you cannot deny the many *false* Miracles which have been notoriously detected in the Church of *Rome.* But if one *Sham-Miracle* had been found in the *Apostles*, I am afraid it had discredited all the others, and called their Mission in question whether it was from *God* or not. The *Devil* has Power (when Permitted) to *shew great Signs and Wonders*, as we are told *Mat.* xxiv. 24. 2 *Thess.* ii. 9. and the Reason is given *verse* 12. *viz.* as a just Punishment to *Unrighteousness.* But one *False* or Pretended *Miracle* is sufficient to disprove all that come from the same Hand. Therefore your Books of *Miracles*, the *Legends*, must

either all be believed, or all rejected, all coming from the same Authority; and the greatest part of them are so very gross and simple, that no Man of Sense among you will say, that he can believe half of them. And your Learned call them *Piæ Fraudes*, *Holy Cheats*, to stir up the Devotion of the *Vulgar*, who swallow all *Implicity!* And your Lordship will have Difficulty enough to believe all the *Miracles* alledged of their *Reliques*. And, as I said, you must take all, or none. Unless you think that *God* can work true *Miracles*, and the *Devil* false ones, by the same means, and at the same time! Can you believe the Quantities that have been shewn of the *Virgin Mary*'s Milk at several times and places? And so of the Wood of the *Cross* that is shewed in many places? Is it the same *Head* or *Body* of the same *Saint*, that is shewn at different *Churches*, each of which contend that they have the true one? And each have *Miracles* to vouch the Truth of their *Relique!* You may see a large Collection of these, and the Monstrousness of the Legends out of which they are taken, in a Book intituled, *The Devotions of the Roman Church*. Which will prevent my giving Instances in all the Points before mentioned.

Upon the whole, this Pretence of *Miracles*, the *Legends*, and Shops of *Reliques*, which are bought and sold, instead of a Proof, are the greatest Prejudice to Men of Sense against your Church.

And

And it is the forest Blow that *Christianity* has received, while the common People put these *Legends* upon the Level with the Holy *Scriptures*, as having both the same Foundation, that is, the *Authority* of your *Church*. Whence *Atheists* and *Deists* take a Handle to render both alike Fabulous.

(12.) *L.* But after all, we believe the *Scriptures* upon the Authority of the *Church*.

G. This is the old *Circle* out of which you can never Conjure your selves. You believe the *Scriptures*, because the *Church* bids you; and you believe the Church because the *Scriptures* bid you. This is running round, and proving a thing by it self.

L. No. For we establish the Authority of the *Church* in the first place, thus We think it inconsistent with the Goodness of *God* not to give Men an *Infallible Guide* to lead them in the right way to Heaven, since our own *Reason* is so weak that we cannot trust to it: and that Guide is the *Church*.

G. How do you know that? What have you but your own *Reason* to tell you so? And if you cannot trust your *Reason*, you cannot believe the *Church*. So that all bottoms upon your own *Reason* still, from which you strive in vain to escape.

L. But the *Scriptures* bid us believe the *Church*.

G. This is running into your *Circle* again, to believe the *Church* for the *Scriptures*, and the

the *Scriptures* for the *Church*. But I will bring you out of it. For pray tell me, why do you believe a *God*? It would be Blasphemy to say, you believe it upon any *Authority*, for that would place such an *Authority* above *God*. And it would be Nonsense to say you believe it either from the *Church*, or the *Scriptures*; because you can believe neither, without first believing there is a *God*. What is it then? We believe a *God* purely upon our own *Reason*. And we cannot be more sure that there is a *God*, than we are perswaded of the Truth of those *Reasons* upon which we do believe it. And if *God* has given us no other Guide but our own *Reason*, with the assistance of his *Grace*, to believe in himself; if this be all we have, or can have, for the first and main Article of our *Creed*, what further do we require for those of less Consequence? And that we cannot have more Assurance than this, we may perceive by this Experiment, *viz.* Whether we believe most firmly and with greatest Assurance, what we have only from our own *Reason*, or what we receive upon the Authority of the *Church*? For Example, are you not more undoubtedly assured of the Being of a *God* which you believe purely upon your own *Reason*, than of *Transubstantiation*, *Purgatory*, or whatever you believe upon the Authority of your *Church*?

And to say, that *God* is obliged to give every Man an *outward infallible Guide*, is making too Bold with *Providence*, and measuring his

infinite

infinite Wisdom and Goodness by our short Line. He has made Creatures as it has pleased Him. Some incapable of Happiness or Misery, as the *Inanimates*; some capable only of Pleasures or Pain of *Sense*, as *Animals*; and He has endowed others with *Reason*, as *Man*, and *left him in the hand of his own Counsel, set Good and Evil, Life and Death before him*, and free Will to chuse which liketh him, *Deut.* xi. 26. xx. 15. *Ecclus.* xv. 14. *&c.* Again of Rational Creatures, some He has fixed in Happiness, as the Blessed of Heaven; others are Vessels of Wrath, as the Angels that fell: But Man is betwixt these two, to work out his own Salvation by his Obedience to the Will of God. Who will Judge every Man according to what He has given him. *For as many as have Sinned without the Law, shall be judged without the Law, as they that have Sinned in the Law, shall be judged by the Law. For there is no respect of Persons with God*, Rom. ii. 11. 12. But according to your Argument there is great Respect of Persons with Him, and His Goodness has failed the far greatest Part of Mankind from the beginning of the World; for what outward Guide is there to *Jews*, *Heathens*, *Mahometans*, and *Christians*; and to the many Subdivisions among all these? And all these have Guides of their own, and the Blind lead the Blind with most of them. For it is Fact that the Generality of Mankind do not chuse for themselves, but take their Religion upon Trust as they are

Educated,

Educated. And we must leave all this to God, who will require from none more than He has given; for *the Lord is good to all: and His tender Mercies are over all his Works*, Psal. cxlv. 9.

(13.) *L.* Can any be saved then but by *Christ?*

G. No. But many may be saved by Him who never heard of him. He dyed to make Satisfaction to the Infinite Justice for the Sins of the whole World: and took our *Nature* upon Him, to atone for our fallen *Nature*, to be applied to such who perform the Conditions required. He will judge the *Gentiles* by the Law of *Morality*, which he has planted in their Hearts, and we call *Natural Religion*: But from *Christians* He requires *Faith* in *Christ*, joined with sincere *Repentance*.

L. Then the *Gentiles* are in better Condition than we, because less is required of them.

G. Is it no Advantage then to have the *Glory of God* revealed to us, *in the face of Jesus Christ?* As the Apostle speaks, 2 *Cor.* iv. 6. And the Effect of it upon us is described, chap. 3. ver. 18. viz. *That we all with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.* The sight of the wonderful Oeconomy of our Redemption must needs fill our Souls with Rapture and Joy, when we behold the Glory of God in

all

all His Attributes, each Exalting the other to the Uttermost, as it is said, *Jam.* ii. 13. *Misericordia Superexaltat Judicium*, that the *Mercy* of God exalts His *Justice*; for *Justice* requires full *Satisfaction*, it cannot remit a farthing: To Remit is *Mercy* and not *Justice*: And God is *Justice* itself, *Justice* in the Abstract. Here then Infinite *Wisdom* finds out a full *Satisfaction* to Infinite *Justice*: And Infinite *Goodness* affords that *Satisfaction*, by the *Incarnation*, perfect *Obedience*, Meritorious *Passion*, and Glorious *Resurrection*, &c. of the only begotten *Son* of *God!* This enflames our *Devotion*, invigorates our *Obedience*, and gives Compunction to our *Repentance*, when we *have sinned and come short of the glory of God*, Rom. iii. 23. God has vouchsafed to make a *Covenant* with us in *Christ*, by vertue of which we may appeal to His *Justice* and *Veracity*. It is a *Pardon* Signed and Sealed by the *King*, which we may Plead in Court. The *Heathen* have not this, but they are still under his *Mercy*, they may say, God is *merciful* to forgive us: But we may say with St. *John*, that God is *Faithful* and *Just* to *forgive us our Sins, and to cleanse us from all Unrighteousness*, 1 John i. 9. This is a great, a very great Advantage we have above the *Gentiles*. And may not we enjoy it with Thankfulness, and not Damn them all to the Pit of Hell? Because God has made a *Covenant* with us, may we not leave them to His *Un-covenanted* Mercy? Is our Eye evil to them, because He has been good to us? Or would

would we limit His Mercies to His Creatures, with whom we have nothing to do? *For what have we to do to Judge them that are without?* ——*Them that are without God judgeth*, 1 Cor. v. 12. And God did Judge one who was *without*; that is, out of the Pale of the *Church*, to be the most Beloved of God, and that *there was none like him in the Earth*, Job i. 8. And he is put upon the Level with the greatest in the Church, *Though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it*, &c. Ezek. xiv. 14. And as God chose a *Gentile* to be the great Example of *Patience* to all Ages, *Jam.* v. 11. And of another *Gentile* it was said by Christ, *I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel*, Luk. vii. 9. And He who said often to His Disciples, *O ye of little Faith*; And upbraided his Apostles with their Unbelief, *Mark* xvi. 14. yet said to a Woman of *Canaan*, (who would not be discouraged for the Objection He put against her, of her not being within the Pale of the Church, but without among the Dogs) *O Woman great is thy faith*, Matth. xv. 26. And of the ten healed there was but one thankful, *and he was a Samaritan*, Luke xvii. 16. that is, a *Schismatick*, a *Stranger*, as Christ here calls him, *ver.* 18. and said to him, *thy Faith hath made thee whole.* And the Pattern of *Charity* is placed in the Person of a *Samaritan*, in opposition to both a *Priest* and a *Levite*, Luke x. 30. &c. Which makes good what St. *Peter* said of *Cornelius* a *Gentile*, Acts x. 34. *Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of Persons: But in every Nation, he that feareth Him,*

and

and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. This is the Doctrine which *Christ* taught, *Luke* iv. 25. *&c.* When he minded the *Jews*, that a Widow of *Sarepta*, a City of *Sidon*, and *Naaman* the *Syrian* were preferred to all the Widows and Lepers in *Israel*. Which so enraged the *Jews*, tenacious of the Privilege of the *Church*, that they *thrust Him out of the City, and led him unto the brow of the Hill (whereon their City was built) that they might cast him down headlong.* And it is said, that they were *filled with Wrath*. The like Fury they shewed when St. *Paul* told them that the Gospel was to be extended beyond the Pale of their *Church*, and that God had sent him to the *Gentiles*. *And they gave him Audience unto that word, and then lift up their voices, and said, Away with such a fellow from the Earth; for it is not fit that he should live. And they cried out, and cast off their clothes, and threw dust into the Air*, Acts xxii. 22. And the like Rage is seen among the Zealots of your Church, when they hear of the Gospel being extended out of the Pale of their Communion; though with *Christians* who hold the three ancient *Creeds*, and have every thing Essential to a *Church*, except what *Rome* has made so, *viz.* The Universal and Unlimited *Soveraignty* of her *Bishop*. Which is the great Bone of Contention, wherein *Rome* stands single by her self, thrusting all other Christian Churches from her; like a Man in a Boat who thinks he thrust the Shore from him, whereas he only thrust himself from the Shore;

Shore; as *Firmilian* said to *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, *Excidisti te ipsum, nolite fallere*, — "Do "not deceive your self, you have cut your "self off from the Church; for he is truly a "*Schismatick* who has made himself an Apo-"state from the Communion of Ecclesiastical "Unity; for while you think you can Ex-"communicate all other Churches from you, "you have only Excommunicated your self "from them. *Dum enim putas omnes à te Abstineri posse, te ipsum Abstinuisti.* Cyprian Ep. 75. p. 228. Edit. Oxon.

But the Church of the *Jews* had a much stronger Plea for her Universal *Supremacy* and *Infallibility*, because all *Proselytes*, of whatever Nations, must come in to Her, for there was no other visible *Church* of God upon Earth; and the Sacrifices were limited to the Temple at *Jerusalem*. Accordingly we find, *Acts* viii. 27. that the *Eunuch* came out of *Ethiopia* to *Jerusalem* for to Worship.

Now if the Christian Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, the most solemn Worship of God, were confined to St. *Peter's Church* at *Rome*, and could be had no where else; as the most solemn Worship of God; the legal Sacrifices, which were Types of the Christian, were confined to the *Temple* at *Jerusalem*: And if the Church of *Rome*, like that of the *Jews*, were the only *Church* in the World: Yet after all, would the *Church* of *Rome* have no more Pretence to *Infallibility* and *Perpetuity* than the *Church* of the *Jews* had

had. And as the *Church* of the *Jews* has been cut off, for her Disobedience to the Law of God: So (as before mentioned) has it been said to the *Church* of *Rome* particularly, *Thou also shalt be cut off*, that is, upon the same condition, *if thou continue not in the goodness of God*, Rom. xi. 22. And we cannot imagine there should be a *Church* of *Rome* visibly as now, with a *Pope* at the Head of it, and a Number of *Bishops*, *Cardinals*, &c. under him, holding the true Christian *Faith*, when that Time comes which our Saviour has foretold, *Luke* xviii. 8. *When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find Faith on the Earth?* For then it would be found, and very visibly at *Rome*.

But that State of the Church is better Represented by the 7000 who had not bowed to *Baal*, but of whom *Elijah* knew none, but thought he was *left alone*, Rom. xi. 3, 4. This was a State of *Segregation*, there were particular Persons who kept the Faith, but invisible to the World, or to one another; without any publick Worship, or so much as private Meetings, for *Elijah* would surely have known of these, and been the Principal among them: Far less could they have had an Organized *Church*, with *Pastors* and *Rulers* over them, without being known to *Elijah*, and to many more, even to their Persecutors; who found out the most private Recesses of the Primitive Christians, and their Meetings, though in the most secret man-

ner, for Divine Worship; and their Bishops too, whom they seized and hauled to Prisons and to Martyrdom, for they could not lye hid, and the *Faith* was then visible, though under Persecution. Therefore it must be a much more Universal Depravity and Corruption of the *Church* of which our Saviour spoke, when Faith should not be found, at least visibly, upon the Earth. It will be more like the State of the *Church* before the Flood, represented by the *Ark, wherein few, that is eight Souls were saved*, 1. Pet. 2. 20. And as the Corruption of the old World was great, we may suppose the Corruption to be greater before the second coming of Christ, as the Destruction by *Fire* is more terrible than that by *Water*. However such an Universal Corruption is here foretold, as will in no ways consist with the least sort of that *Visibility* which the Church of *Rome* requires as a Mark of the true Church, and to continue with her for ever.

But on the other hand, if there shall be a visible *Church* in those Days, then that *Church*, at least the *Generality*, which is the *Visibility* of it, will fall from the *Faith*, else it would be *visibly* to be found upon the *Earth*; and then Men will be misled by the *Church*, and by those *Marks* of *Visibility*, &c. which the Church of *Rome* gives her; in like manner as they were misled by the *Church* before, when she commanded them to reject their *Messiah*. He came first unto *His own*, the

Church

Church of the *Jews*, the only visible *Church* then upon the Earth, but she *received Him not*, John i. 11. for she was Corrupt and Blinded, under the Mask of Pharisaical Sanctity, and strict observance of the Law, even to the *Tything of Mint, Annise, and Cummin*; she was Zealous in the outward Observances, but neglected *the weightier Matters of the Law, Judgment, Mercy, and Faith*, Matth. xxiii. 23. And so it may be at the second coming of Christ, as it was at the first; for there is no more Promise of Infallibility to the one State of the Church, than to the other.

L. But it was Prophesied in the Old Testament, that the *Jews* should reject their *Messiah* at His first Coming.

G. And in the New Testament, that at His second coming *He should not find Faith upon the Earth.*

But the *Jews* did not so understand these Prophesies against themselves. They said that the *Church* was the only *Interpreter* of *Scripture*, and they must take the *Law* from the Mouth of their *Priests*: And the *Church* did interpret these *Scriptures* otherwise than *Christ* did.

L. But *Christ* being come, He was then the *Church*.

G. He was not the *Church*, for He came to Redeem the *Church*. He did not come to Redeem *Himself*. He was the *Head*, the *Church*, the *Body*; but the *Head* is not the *Body*.

Besides it is perfectly Begging the Question of the *Jews*, to suppose that *Christ* was the Mes-

siah; for that they deny, and bid us prove it. That is the whole Question betwixt them and us.

L. His Heavenly *Doctrine*, His *Miracles*, and the *Prophesies* of Him, prove Him to be the *Messiah*.

G. The *Jews* answer all this by the *Authority* of the *Church*, which said, *Have any of the Rulers, or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this People who knoweth not the Law, are cursed.* John vii. 48, 49. And to rivet this Curse, they *Excommunicated* those who did confess *Christ*, chap. ix. 22, 34. xvi. 2. And they said, That *Christ* wrought his *Miracles* by *Beelzebub*, Matth. ix. 34. xii. 24. And who was to be *Judge* in this Case, the *People* or the *Church*? Upon the Foot of the *Authority* of the *Church*, it was impossible at that time for any to be a *Christian*. Therefore of all Men, *Christians* have the least reason to insist upon this.

(14.) *L.* Then I find you resolve all upon *private Judgment*.

G. It is all we have for the belief of a *God*, or of *Christ*, and, by your own Confession, for the Choice of a *Church*. And then we may well trust to it in smaller Matters. In short, we must trust to it in every thing without Exception: For it is as impossible to believe any thing without our *Understanding*, as to see without our *Eyes*.

L. But you believe some *Mysteries* which you pretend not to understand or explain, as the

the Doctrine of the Holy *Trinity*, the *Incarnation*, &c.

G. My *Reason* tells me, That there must be many things in the Nature of *God* which I cannot understand or explain, because He is Infinite and Incomprehensible. And these I take purely upon the *Revelation* that is given of them in the Holy *Scriptures*, for my own *Reason* could never have found them out, nor can perfectly understand them. They are dark to me, like a Country I never saw, I cannot have a right Idea of it till I come thither. As I cannot of *Heaven*, or of the State of separate *Souls*. Yet I cannot help framing some Conception to my self, of what I know *never entred into the Heart of Man to Conceive*, that is, aright, and according to these things are. Therefore I take not upon me to explain them, for that would be to involve my self; and I know that I must greatly Err. And yet it would be as much against *Reason* to deny these things, as to deny there was any *Country* in the World, or *Star* in the *Firmament*, which I had not seen. And much more *unreasonable*, it would be, to think there was nothing in the Nature of the *Infinite* Being which I did not comprehend: Or because that cannot be expressed to us, but in words adapted to our Understanding, therefore to measure his Nature by ours; and because *Peter*, *James*, and *John* are three Men, therefore to think that *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost* must be three *Gods*. But when I say *three Persons*, with relation to

the *Divine Trinity*, there comes not such a Thought in my Head as *three Persons of Men*; but because *Personal* Actions are attributed to each of the *Divine Three*, therefore we call them *Persons*, which word the *Scripture* applies to God, *Heb.* i. 3. But it is only *ad Captum*, as the Schools speak, that is, Condescending our Capacity, as when God is said to *Repent*, to *Grieve*, &c. it is not that we should think it really so, for that would be contradictory to the Nature of God; but it conveys a Notion to us, that we should act as if it were so, that God were *Angry* or *Grieved* at our Sins, and would *Repent* of the Blessings He had given or promised to us, if we took not heed to walk in His Ways which He has set before us.

(15.) *L.* I am afraid the *Deists* will think this a straining the Point in favour of *Revelation*, and say that they are much easier without it.

G. They will not find it so, when they consider that they are in no less Difficulties upon following their own *Reason* only; for Example, they allow a *first Cause* and *Creator* of all things, because nothing can make it self: And that *first Cause* must have a *necessary* Being, and consequently from all Eternity; and that *Eternity* is a *Duration* without *Succession* or *Time*, or having any *Beginning*, wherein all is *Present*, without either *Past* or *to Come*. This the *Deist* is forced to confess upon the Conviction of

his

his *Reason*: But he will not pretend to have so much as any *Idea* or *Conception* what this *Eternity* is or can be, nor can he *imagine* a *Duration* without *Beginning*, in which there is nothing *past*, nor any thing to *come*. Nor can he express this any otherwise than in Words of *Time*, which he must own are not at all *proper* or *applicable* to it; the very word *Beginning* is inconsistent with *Eternity*, and to say *before* the *Beginning*, is a Contradiction. Here then he is lost, and must have recourse to the same Excuse which he ridicules in *Revelation*, viz. That we cannot speak *properly* of *God*, nor in other words than what belong to *Men*, and therefore that these *words* are not to be taken *strictly*, nor Argued upon, or Consequences drawn from them, for that this would involve us in numberless *Contradictions*. And there is not one Objection which the *Deist* or *Socinian* makes against the Doctrine of the Holy *Trinity*, the *Incarnation*, &c. but are of this sort, by Arguing from the Nature of *Man* to the Nature of *God*, from the *Persons* of the one, to the *Persons* of the other, *&c.* Which these Men of *Reason* think highly *unreasonable* in their own Case, as to argue from *Time* to *Eternity*, &c.

(16.) *L.* But, Sir, the *Deist* would ask you, upon what Authority you believe that *Revelation*, viz. of the *Scriptures*? And since you will not have it built upon the *Authority* of

the *Church*, I see not what other *Authority* you can alledge for it.

G. Nor I neither, for I put it upon no *Authority*. It is *Evidence*, and not *Authority*, upon which my Belief of the *Scriptures* is founded.

L. Then you believe upon the *Authority* of *Evidence*.

G. That expression is not proper, though sometimes carelessly used: For *Authority* and *Evidence* are two things, if I believe a thing for your telling me so, without any other Reason, then I believe it purely upon your *Authority*; but if a Man I never saw before makes a thing very *evident* to me, and convinces my *Reason*, I believe not then upon his *Authority*, for he has none with me, but upon the *Evidence* he has given me. And what that *Evidence* is upon which we believe the Holy *Scriptures*, is set forth in a little Book I had the Honour to Present to your Lordship, Intituled, *The Truth of Christianity Demonstrated*, &c. Which was wrote to Convince *Deists*, who believe no *Church*, or any *Church Authority*. And if you have no other *Evidence* but the *Authority* of your *Church* to prove the Truth of the *Scriptures*, I see not how you will ever convince a *Deist*, who denies both.

But if I tell him that I believe the *Scriptures*, and the *Facts* therein related, upon the same, and much stronger *Evidence* than I have for believing there was such a Man

as

as *Alexander* or *Cæsar*, that there is such a Town as *Rome* or *Constantinople*, though I was never there. Yet I believe it, not upon the *Authority*, far less the *Infallibility* of any Man or Number of Men, that tell me so; but from the Nature of the *Evidence* which makes it impossible for Mankind to concert such a Lye, or to carry it on, without being Detected. And if the Truth of *Christianity*, that is, of the *Scriptures*, can be Demonstrated as plainly as these other *Facts*, (which I think is done in the Book I mentioned) then a *Deist* must either be convinced or confounded.

Now if you will let your *Church* come in as Part of the *Evidence* of *Christianity*, she will not be Refused, so far as her Share goes: But upon her *Authority*, and upon hers alone, the Truth of the *Scriptures*, and of *Christianity*, will be a Jest to the *Deists*; since her *Authority* can be proved no otherwise than by the *Scriptures*, and then back again, the *Scriptures* by her *Authority*!

L. But several Parts of the *Scriptures* have been disputed, as you reject those Books you call *Apocryphal* out of the *Canon* of the *Old Testament*: And the Antient *Hereticks* forged false *Gospels* and false *Epistles* in the Names of the Apostles: And as the Canon of the *New Testament* now stands, some of the *Epistles* have been disputed by some Learned Men. And this could not be determined, nor the *Canon* established, but by the *Authority* of the Church.

G. As

G. As to the *Apocryphal* Books, we Received the *Canon* of the *Old Testament* from the *Church* of the *Jews*, which never admitted them into the *Canon* of their *Scriptures*. And how should we know their *Canon* better than themselves?

Again, we are sure they were not in the *Christian Canon* in the Days of St. *Jerome*, if he knew what was Received by the *Church* as the *Canon* of *Scripture*, for in his *Prologus Galeatus*, Printed before your own *Vulgar Latin*, he rejects them as *Apocryphal*, and says they were not in the *Canon* of the Holy *Scriptures*.

Inter Apochrypha esse ponenda ------ Non sunt in Canone.

But as to these Books themselves, let any one but read the Conclusion of them, in Excuse for the Weakness of the Performance, and then think it possible, if he can, that the *Holy Ghost* should make such a Speech as this—*If I have done well—it is what I desired, but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto.* Or as your *Vulgar* has it, *Si quidem bene, & ut Historiæ competit, hoc & ipse velim: Si autem minus digne, concedendum est mihi.* That is, *I ask your Pardon, if I have not done my Work as it ought to be.*

2 *Machab.* xv. 38.

But as to a full Examination of the *Apocryphal* Books, and their Authority, I refer your Lordship to Dr. *Cosin* his *Scholastical History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture*. Printed

ted 1657. And not yet answered that I can hear of.

L. But the *Canon* of the *New Testament* was established upon the Authority of the *Church.*

G. No, my Lord, not at all by her *Authority*, but plainly by *Evidence*, they proceeded wholly upon *Evidence*, *viz.* whether such an *Epistle* was sent to such a *Church*, as to the Church of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *Galatia*, &c. Who carefully kept the *Originals*, and sent *Copies* to other *Churches*, as was Commanded, *Col.* iv. 16. And by this Communication of the *Churches* one with another, the true *Scriptures* were known, and it is commonly set down at the end of the Epistles by what *Hand* they were sent. And by this method the *spurious Epistles* and *Gospels* forged by *Hereticks* were at first detected, as you will find in the last Chapter of the fifth Book of *Eusebius* his *Ecclesiastical History*, where it is told, That the *Hereticks* were brought to this Test, and could not produce the *Originals* whence they took their *Copies* : And that their *Copies* did vary from one another, every one adding what Opinion came into his own Head : And that they could not tell from whom they had learned such *New Doctrines.* Thus the *Canon* of the *New Testament* was settled in those Ages when these Evidences were fresh and notorious; And has been received since that time by all the Christian *Churches* in the World, so unanimously, that there is no Dispute betwixt any *Churches* concerning

cerning the *Canon* of the *New Testament*. And this is an *Evidence* too strong for the Caprice of some particular Men who would shew their Wit in making Objections against this or that Part. But this cannot hurt the *Faith*, because the whole *Faith* is over and over again fully Expressed and Contained in those Gospels and Epistles, which are acknowledged by all.

L. But there are various *Lections* and *Translations* of the *Scriptures* into many *Languages*, which agree not exactly, and in every point, with one another. And how shall we examine this by *Evidence?* What *Evidence* is there in this Case? Here the *Authority* of the Church must come in to determine between these various *Lections* and *Translations*. And these various *Lections* or different *Readings* of several *Texts* are very many, which some Learned Men have taken pains to collect.

G. But there is no difference among them in any thing material or what concerns the *Faith*. So that this instead of an Objection (which the *Deists* make use of to invalidate the Truth of the *Scriptures* and the Certainty of our *Faith*) proves a stronger Confirmation of both, in that among so many various *Readings* and *Translations* no material Difference is found; or other than may, and without a Miracle must happen in so many thousand *Copies* and *Impressions* as have been made of the *Scriptures*. And none I suppose will pretend that every *Writer* or *Printer* is *infallible*, not to mistake a *Letter* or a *Word*, or misplace them. But that nothing

thing of this sort has happened to the Detriment of the *Faith*, or making Disputes in any thing that is material, must be attributed to a very particular Providence.

And the Church of *Rome* has not undertaken, nor was it worth her while, to attempt the Adjusting of the various *Readings*: For in that *Translation* which she has most Approved, the *Vulgar Latin*, some of the various *Lections* are given on the Margin of her own Editions.

But what signifies the *Latin* which is not the Vulgar Language of any Nation now in the World, I say, what does this signify to the People who understand it not?

L. Therefore to answer your Objections of our locking up the *Scriptures* from the *People*, we have them now translated into the Vulgar Tongues of each Country, particularly in *France*, where they are publickly sold in the Shops.

G. This instead of an Answer to the Objection, is a confessing to it, and owning it to have been just and necessary. And thus much your People have gained by our *Reformation*.

But alas, my Lord, what have they gained? There is something worse than even a total Locking up the Scriptures in these *Translations*, that is, a *corrupting* the *Text* to deceive the People, different from even your own *Vulgar Latin* Translation, which you have authorized. This is made apparent in the Collection, printed here at *London*, of the many *Texts* thus evidently abused, both by adding to them

them and taking from them, and misinterpreting them; in the *French New Testament* printed in *France* for the use of the New Converts there. And this has occasioned the Suppression of that *New Testament*, insomuch that few of them are to be found, at least they are not publickly Sold now at *Paris*.

L. If they are suppressed, then your Complaints are answered. But have you any Objection against the *Louvain* Translation now Printed and Sold at *Paris*, with the Approbation of the Doctors and Divines there?

G. Yes, my Lord, here is one in my Hand, bought in *Rue St. Jaques* in *Paris*, where they are Printed, with the Approbations before them, in the Year 1701. And in this Translation there are many *Mistranslations*, I will shew your Lordship one; it is said, *Acts* xiii. 2. *As they ministred to the Lord.* The *Vulgar Latin* has it in the same Words, *Ministrantibus illis Domino.* But this *French* Translation is in these Words, *Or comme ils offroient au Seigneur le Sacrifice de la Messe. When they had offered to the Lord the Sacrifice of the Mass.*

L. I suppose they took that to be the Meaning of the Words.

G. Your Lordship may suppose so. But, My Lord, what the Import of the *Words is*, or what Consequences may be drawn from them, is what we call *Exposition* or *Commenting* upon the Text; but to alter the *Words* of the *Text* is of another Nature, it is false *Translation*, and not an *Interpretation*; and comes under that

that terrible Curse pronounced *Rev.* xxii. 18, 19. against those who add to, detract from, or pervert the Words of Holy *Scripture.*

And to shew that this was not done by chance, and what Use they intended to make of this Text thus Translated, *Acts* xiii. 2. They put upon the Margin, *La Sainte Messe, the holy Mass.* That the People might here find a plain *Text* of *Scripture* for the *Mass* and the *Sacrifice* of it. And in the *Index* (which is done by the same Authority as the Translation) upon the Word *Messe*, this *Text* is named as a Proof that the *Apostles* did celebrate *Mass.*

This *Sacrifice* of the *Mass* is a plain *Addition* to the *Text.* Let me give one Instance of *Substracting* from it. It is said, *Heb.* xi. 21. That *Jacob worshipped* ἐπὶ *upon* or leaning *upon the Top of his Staff.* But this *French* Translation leaves out the Word ἐπὶ *upon*, and renders it that he *Worshipped the top of his Staff. Adora le Haut de son Baton.* And in the *Index* at the Word *Adoration* this *Text* is quoted for the *Adoration of Wood, L'Adoration fait aux Bois.* Heb. xi. 21. Belike they thought there was some *Image* carved or painted on the Top of *Jacob*'s Staff which he worshipped! And so this is made a *Text* for *worshipping their wooden Images* and *Pictures!* Especially the solemn *Worship* of the *Cross* every *Good-Friday.* And who knows but that the Head of *Jacob*'s Staff was not round but Crutch-ways, set a-cross (as is usual with old Men) and then the Staff was a perfect *Cross!*

In

In the former *Text* concerning the *Mass* this *French* Translation adds to the Words of their own *Vulgar Latin* as well as of the *Original*: But in this last, the *Vulgar Latin* as well as the *French* substract from the *Original*, and both render this *Text* the same way.

But, to do Justice to all, the *Port Royal Bible* delivers this *Text* from the gross Interpretation put upon it, by means of a false *Translation*, to favour the *worshipping* of *Wood*.

In the other *French* Translation I mentioned before, made for the Use of the new Converts, this Expression 1 *Cor.* iii. 15. of some that shall be saved with great Difficulty, as if *passing through the Fire*, is boldly Rendred, *the fire of Purgatory*, as the *Words* of the *Text*, without any different *Character*, as is used with us when a *Word* is put in to make *English* of an *Hebrew* or *Greek* Idiom. But in this *Louvain* Translation the *Text* is let stand, *so as by fire*, only *Purgatoire* is put on the Margin in this Edition made since the Objections against the other Translation, in which the Addition of *Purgatory* to this *Text* is particularly taken notice of.

I could give your Lordship more of the *Corruptions* of *Texts* in the *French* Translations. I have now only named three, one for the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, another for the *Adoration* of the *Cross* and of *Images*, and one for *Purgatory*.

L. The

L. The *Church* is not answerable for these *Translations*, however approved and recommended by *Doctors*, *Universities*, &c.

(17.) G. But the *People* are deceived by them. The *People* believe as they are taught. There is small Security to them in the Abstruse Disputes concerning *Infallibility*, how far it extends, and where it is placed, and in the Disputes betwixt *Popes* and *Councils* about it. These are Questions of which I suppose your Lordship will easily grant the Common *People* are no Judges. They know nothing of the matter. How should they, when the *Learned* Men are divided among themselves concerning them? So that this *Infallibility*, if it could be found and fixed, would be of little use to the Generality of the People, unless their *Curates* and their *Fathers* and *Mothers* who instruct them, were likewise all of them *Infallible*, for as I said, they believe as they are taught, and examine no further. Nay, they are forbid to examine, for that implies a Doubt, and they are not to doubt of the Religion they are taught, but to receive, without any Doubt, what has been told them by their *Curates*, *Fathers*, *Mothers*, or *Nurses*, and what is current in the Country where they live. This is all the *Infallibility* of which they are capable. And this is the way of all the Earth. It is thus that the Generality of Mankind, whether *Heathens*, *Jews*, *Mahometans*, or *Christians*, receive their *Religion*. And

without examining into what we have been taught, no Man could change his Religion. None could ever have become a *Christian*, especially no *Jew*, who had the *Authority* of his *Church* against *Christ*, to which *Church* he alledges Promises of *Perpetuity* and *Infallibility*.

(18.) *L.* The Bishop of *Meaux* has cleared this in his Conference with Mr. *Cloud*: Where the Bishop asserts the Necessity of a *Living Infallible Judge* always in being to direct Men. And says, that when Christ was come, He was that *Living Judge*, and so the Authority of the *Jewish Church* was superseded.

G. This is *Gratis dictum* and begging the Question of the *Jew*, as I have said already, who upon the Authority of his *Church*, denies our *Christ* to have been the *Messiah*. I will not repeat, only ask these few Questions further. 1. Who was this *Living Judge* before the *Flood*? For the Bishop says there must be always such an one in being. 2. Was *Abraham*, who was known only to a few Neighbours, and wrought no *Miracles* to convince others, was he, I say, given as such a *Guide* or *Judge* to the whole *Earth*? And *Christ* was not so great a Traveller as *Abraham*. 3. Where was this *Living Judge* when *Christ* was Dead? And if there was none for three Days, it might be so for three, or three Hundred Years, or for good and all, because the

the Argument fails for the *Necessity* of such a *Judge* always in being. You will not say the *Church* can fail for three Days. The Promises of God can never fail, no not for a Moment.

L. *Christ* founded His *Church* before He died, and left his *Apostles* for Guides, chiefly *Peter* the Prince and Principle of Unity to them all.

G. And yet of the *Apostles*, one *betrayed* Him, another *forswore* Him (and that was *Peter*) all *forsook* Him.

L. That was human Frailty, and Personal: But they retained the true *Faith*, they were in no Error as to that.

G. The greatest that could be, *For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that He must rise again from the Dead.* John xx. 9. *And if Christ be not Raised, your Faith is vain: ye are yet in your Sins*, 1 Cor. xv. 17. And the Reason given for choosing *Matthias* into the room of *Judas* was, *That he might be a witness with the other Apostles of the Resurrection of Christ.* Acts i. 22. And what *Faith* could they have in Him whom they had quite given over, and never expected to see him more? *They trusted that it had been He who should have redeemed Israel*, Luke xxiv. 21. But when He was Dead, all their Hopes were gone, they expected no Redemption from Him. This was far from a *Christian Faith*, and could there be a *Christian Church* without this *Faith*?

To avoid all this; and secure the Promise of *Indefectibility*, to the *Church*, some of your Authors of greatest Name have said, that the *Church* was then preserved in the Virgin *Mary*. And thence infer that the *Catholick Church* may be preserved in one *Woman*, as it was then, and that so it may be again, in the times of *Anti-christ*, and the great *Defection* is fotetold will be before the *second Coming* of *Christ*, when *Faith shall not be found upon the Earth*, that is very hardly, when it may be confined to one *Laick*, a *Woman*, or a Baptized *Infant*, as others of your Doctors allow.

Bannes com. in 2. 2. Quest. In Art. 10. Dub. 2.

L. This is giving up the *Church* quite, as a *Society*, with *Government*, *Discipline*, &c. and I hardly believe any of our approved Authors have said so much, and not been censured for it.

G. They are no less Men than *Alensis*, the Author of the *Gloss* upon the *Decretals*, *Lyra*, *Occam*, *Alliaco*, *Panormitan*, *Turrecremata*, *Peter de Monte*, St. *Antoninus*, *Cusanus*, *Clemangis*, *Jacobatius*, *J. Fr. Picus*, &c. And to save Repetition, your Lordship will find their Books and Words quoted, in this small Treatise in my Hand intituled, *The incurable Scepticism of the Church of* Rome, printed here 1688. *p.* 22. *&c.* I name this little Tract, because it is short, and will give your Lordship no great trouble, and proceeds upon the same Argument I have undertaken with your Lordship, instead of the particular points in Dispute

Dispute betwixt the Church of *Rome* and us, as *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, &c. to go at once to the bottom of the Cause, and examine the Ground and Foundation of *Faith*, as taught in the Church of *Rome*; which is shewed, I think to a Demonstration, to be wholly precarious and uncertain: And that there is no greater Difference and Confusion among any sort of Men, upon any Subject whatsoever, than there is among the Divines of the Church of *Rome*, concerning her *Rule of Faith*, and *Infallible Judge of Controversy*. And every one of the different Opinions about it, is in flat Contradiction to all the others, so that if any one of them be true, all the rest must be false: And yet they all pretend to believe with *Divine Faith*, and think it necessary in this case, because it is the *Foundation* of their *Faith*.

Now if according to these Learned Doctors, the whole *Church* failed upon our Saviour's Death, then the *Gates of Hell* did prevail for a time. And if the Virgin *Mary* were excepted, that would not do much as to the Standing of the *Church*. But have they any *Revelation*, to ground *Divine Faith* upon, or upon what Grounds do they believe, that the Virgin *Mary* knew the *Scriptures*, or the *Resurrection of Christ*, more than the *Apostles*, and was not under the same Despondency as they were? This seems to be that *Sword* which *Simeon* told her, should *pierce through her own Soul also*, Luke ii. 35.

L. To avoid all these things, some suppose, That the *Christian Church* was not formed till the Descent of the *Holy Ghost* at *Pentecost*, when *Peter* converted about 3000, as told in the 2d of the *Acts*. And that it was of this *Christ* spoke, when He told *Peter* that He would build His *Church* upon him, and called Him a *Rock*, and that it was fulfilled at this time, when *Peter* was made the Instrument of that first and great Conversion, which was the Foundation of all that followed.

G. If the *Christian Church* was not formed, as some think, till after the *Resurrection*, because our Redemption was not till then compleated: Or, as others think, till the *Ascension*, when *Christ* commissioned his *Apostles* to *go and teach all Nations*, Matth. xxviii. 19. Or till the Descent of the *Holy Ghost*, when they were *endued with Power from on High*. Luke xxiv. 49. Yet any of these ways it will follow that there was no *Christian Church* before the *Death* of *Christ*. And then that the *Jewish* was the only true *Church* while *Christ* lived in the World. For the *Jewish* Church was to last till the *Christian* was formed, else there was no *Church* at all after *Christ* came, till His *Resurrection*. And then it would follow, that the only True *Church* in the World did reject our *Christ*. And then there will be no Choice left us, but either to acknowledge the *Fallibility* of the *Church*, or to reject *Christ* from being the *Messiah*. But if the *Christian Church* was formed upon the first Appearance of *Christ* in the

World,

World, or upon his Ordaining the Twelve *Apostles*, and sending them out to preach, or upon any other Act done in his Life; then, as said before, the whole *Church* failed upon His *Death*. But if the *Church* cannot fail, no not for a Moment, because of the *Necessity* of a *Living Infallible Judge* always in being, the *Succession* of the *Monarchy* of the *Church* ought to be *Hereditary*, where the *King never Dies*: For this *Scheme* will not admit of an *Inter-Regnum* for *Months* or *Years* that may be spent in the Election of a *Pope*, in all which time the *Church* has no *Head* or *Monarch*. Much less when there are *Popes* and *Anti-Popes*, which has occasioned 26 Schisms in the *Church* of *Rome*, some of them of long Continuance. And who is *Judge* in such a Case? Is every Man left to his own *private Judgment*? And is it all one which of the Contending *Popes* he adheres to, whether to the *Right* or the *Wrong*? Or can the *Church* have two or three opposite *Heads* at the same time?

L. Therefore in *France*, where I received my Education, they place not the *Infallibility* in the *Pope*, but in a *General Council*.

G. I told your Lordship before, that there never was a *Council* truly *General*. That there are Disputes in your *Church* concerning *General Councils*, some receiving those, or Parts of them which others reject. And who shall be *Judge* in this Case?

But suppose you were agreed among your selves concerning your *Councils*, and that they

were *Infallible*, yet they are not a *living Judge* always in being; you have not had one since that of *Trent*, which began in the Year 1545, and concluded in the Year 1563. Now 150 Years ago. And there may not be another in twice that time, if ever. Where then is the *living Judge always in being*, which the *Bishop* of *Meaux* and others think necessary?

L. General Councils may in this Sense be called *Living*, and *always in being*, that their *Canons* are *always in being*, and determin *Controversies* to those who regard them. And if new *Heresies*, or *Controversies*, or *Schisms* of *Popes* arise, new *Councils* may be called to Determin them.

G. And Ages may pass before that can be done. And the *Church* may be corrupted in the mean time for want of such a *living Judge*. As *Europe* is now situated it would be pretty difficult to have a *General Council*. And it may be long enough before any *Pope* may be of Opinion to call one, or hazard his *Supremacy* upon it.

(19.) But, My Lord, the *Canons* of Past *Councils* are not *Living*, nor can speak for themselves. There are Volumes Printed of the Learned in your own Communion giving contrary Expositions of the *Canons*. I will instance in one, the Third Canon of the Fourth, commonly called the *Great Council* of *Lateran*, acknowledged to be a true *General Council* by all of the Church of *Rome*, established in most express and positive Terms, the *Pope*'s Power

of

of Deposing *Princes*, and *Absolving* their *Subjects* from their *Allegiance*, not only if he please to call them *Hereticks* themselves, but if they do not Extirpate all *Hereticks* out of their *Dominions*. This is maintained in the literal Sense by *Bellarmin* and the *Italian* Doctors. On the other hand, the *Gallican* Church who have Condemned the *Deposing* Doctrine, and yet own this Council of *Lateran*, are put to hard Shifts, and many Distinctions to Solve this, but it is impossible, for either that Doctrine must be true, or this *Council* has greatly Erred.

L. But not in *Faith*. This is no Matter of *Faith*.

G. But is it not Matter of *Salvation*, for which we shall be Judged at the last Day? St. *Paul* says, *Rom.* xiii. 2. *They that resist the* (Lawful) *Powers, shall receive to themselves Damnation*——*Wherefore* (says he, *Ver.* 5.) *Ye must needs be Subject, not only for Wrath* (or fear of temporal Punishment from these Powers) *but also for Conscience sake*, that is, towards *God*. And what are these *Guides of Conscience* who lead us *wrong* in this? In the Description of the *last Judgment* given by *Christ*, Matth. xxv. 31. to the end, Men shall be Judged chiefly for their *Practice*. There is nothing mentioned there but what Men have *done*. And have we no *Guide* as to *Practice*, while we raise such Contentions about a *Guide* in *Faith*? Or is the *Church* a *Guide* in *Practice* too? And is a *General Council* the *Church*. Then the *Church* has led us into a damnable *Practice*, unless

less the *Pope* has Power to Depose *Princes* at his Pleasure, and that there is no Sin in *Rebellion*, and all the *Blood* and *Desolation* that follow it, if his *Holiness* so Command!

L. But the Church does not oblige us to *profess* or *subscribe* the *Deposing* Doctrine, no, nor to *believe* it, so that you may be a good *Roman Catholick*, notwithstanding all this. Nay you may *oppose* the *Deposing* Doctrine, as the *Clergy* of *France* do.

G. And may I not be as good a *Roman Catholick* if I do *believe* it, and *defend* it, and *practice* it too? And have I not all the Encouragement the *Church* of *Rome* can give me, the frequent *Practice* of the *Popes* themselves, and here the Canon of a *General Council* for it? And have any of the *Popes* ever yet Renounced it?

L. But the Doctors do not agree about the Sense of that *Canon*. You see *France* takes it in a quite contrary Sense from the *Pope* and *Italian* Doctors.

G. Then your Lordship sees that *Canons* are but a *dead Letter*, and that there may be Disputes about them. And where then is the *Living Infallible Judge* always in being? You see the *Canons* of former *Councils* cannot be this *Judge*. There must be another *Judge* to determine what the true *Sense* of them is. And who should that *Judge* be but the *Pope* the *Head* of the *Church*? I am sure if I were a *Roman Catholick* I should be on that Side. I could shew Your Lordship several other *Canons* of

Councils

Council that are in Dispute among your own Doctors; but that can be no Wonder, when I have already shewed, they are in Dispute about the *Council* themselves. So that there is no Certainty, what the Judgment of your *Church* is. Or rather it is certain that it is most Erroneous, and in Matters that concern our Eternal Salvation, as well as the *Peace* of the *World*, that is, *Rebellion* (among other things) which is as *Witchcraft* and *Idolatry*. I have instanced in this *Sin*, because I know Your Lordship to be tenacious of your Loyalty.

And now, My Lord, since the Saving of our Souls is the End for our being of any *Church*, I leave Your Lordship to Judge, whether the People are safest in the Communion of *Rome*, or of the Church of *England*, as to this Point?

(20.) *L.* They are safe in the Church of *France*, where the *Deposing* Doctrine is disowned.

G. My Lord, our Dispute is with the Church of *Rome*. And if the Church of *France* differs from the Church of *Rome*, in Matters whereon our *Salvation* depends, they cannot be said to be *one Church*, or to have the same Guides to *Heaven*.

But, My Lord, the *Pope's* Deposing Power has extended it self even to *France*, of which you will find frequent Instances in their Histories. And even so late as the *Holy League* against

gainst *Hen.* III. all the Popes in that time joined with the *League* against the King, and supported that *Rebellion* by their Authority. And the Generality of the *Bishops* and *Clergy* of *France*, and their *Universities* took part with the *League*, and justified it by Principle and in Print, the Book *de justa Abdicatione* Henrici III. *Of the just* Abdication *of* Hen. III. *King of* France, was then wrote upon the foot of the *Deposing* Power, not only of the Pope but also of the *People*. And *D'Avila* in his History of these Civil Wars in *France* tells, *A great and Solemn Procession was made by Order from the Cardinal Legat, to implore God's Assistance* (for the Success of the *League* against the *King*) *in which the Prelates, Priests, and Monks of the several* Religious *Orders, walked all in their accustomed Habits; but besides them, Armed openly with Corslets, Guns, Swords, Partisans, and all kind of Arms Offensive and Defensive, making at once a double Shew, both of Devotion, and Constancy of Heart to defend themselves. Which Ceremony though to many it seemed Undecent and* Ridiculous, *yet was of great use to augment and confirm the Courage of the common People.*

D'Avila. *Hist. of the Civil Wars of* France, *English* Translation. Printed in the *Savoy*, 1678. *Lib.* xi. *Pag.* 459.

And the *Cardinal-Legat* says in the *Declaration* he Published to the *Leaguers*, that to acknowledge an *Heretick* for their *King*, is *the Dream of*

Ibid. Lib. xiii. p. 578.

a Mad-man, which proceeds from nothing else but Heretical Contagion.

And the *Leaguers* shew wherein they placed their Confidence, and say, *They are the most holy Fathers* (the Popes) *and the most Holy See that have sent us Relief: And though many have been called to that supreme Dignity* (of the Popedom) *since these last Troubles, yet hath there not been one of them who hath changed his Affection towards us: A most certain Testimony that our Cause is Just.* Ibid. p. 598.

And there had been *Six Popes* during the *League*, viz. *Gregory* XIII. *Sixtus* V. *Urban* VII. *Gregory* XIV. *Innocent* IX. and *Clement* VIII. And they supported that *Rebellion*, not only with their *Blessing* it and the Authors of it, and *Cursing* the *King* and all the *Loyal* Subjects who Adhered to him; but they sent more substantial Relief, *viz.* 300000 Crowns for the Service of the Cardinal of *Bourbon*, whom they had chosen *King*, by the Name of *Charles* the *Tenth*, against the next in Blood, only because he was a *Protestant*; and 15000 Crowns a Month to carry on that *Rebellion*, with an Army of 6000 Foot, and 1200 Horse to Assist these *Holy Leaguers*. The *Pope* went Heart and Hand into this Work, *Which he accounted excellently Good* (says *D'Avila*) *and of wonderful Glory and Advancement to the Apostolick See.* And afterwards, when the Success of the *King's* Arms had induced several of the Ibid. Lib. xii. p. 493, 501, 503. Lib. xi. p. 431.

Clergy

Clergy and others to come over to him, the *Pope* sent his *Monitory Letters* to the *Prelates* and *Catholicks*, commanding them *under Pain of Excommunication, and of being deprived of their Dignities and Benefices, and of being used as Sectaries and Hereticks, that they should withdraw themselves from those Places that yeilded Obedience to* Henry *of* Bourbon (so he stiled the King) *and from the Union and Fellowship of his Faction.* And the Authority of the *Pope* prevailed so far at last, That those *Catholicks* who had joined with the *King* formed a *Conspiracy* against him, upon his Delay of changing his Religion, wherein the *Princes of the Blood* were most violent, and told him plainly to his Face, that if he did not perform his Promise (to turn *Roman Catholick*) they would Desert him, and join with the *Leaguers* See *D'Avila*, p. 611, 612. as likewise, 555, 601, and 605.

Lib. xiii. p. 613.

After his Conversion, and being by that Established upon the Throne, they feared his Power, and therefore the *Pope* (as now) made less Noise with the *Deposing* Doctrine, which yet he would not disown, but keep it *in Petto* till a more fitting Opportunity. But yet it was not carried so Covertly, but that, even in their Sermons, wise and willing Men might know their Meaning. *Ravaillac* upon his Examination, alledged the

See King *James* I. his *Defence of the Right of Kings* against Cardinal *Perron*, p. 4.

the *Lent Sermons* before his Assassination of King *Hen.* IV. as the Ground and Encouragement to that Execrable Fact. But after that Magnanimous Prince had thus fallen a Sacrifice to their Restless furious Zeal, and his Son succeeded Young and Fenceless to the Government then they set up again the *Deposing* Doctrine on High, because then they durst do it. With which our King *James* does justly Upbraid them, particularly his Opponent the Cardinal of *Perron*, in the *Preface* to his Book quoted on the Margin. For it was but Five Years after the Murder of *Henry* IV. *viz.* An. 1615, that Cardinal *Perron* in the Assembly of the *Three Estates* of *France*, and in the Name of the *First Estate*, that is of the *Clergy*, did Re-assert the Power of the *Pope* to Depose *Kings*, with this Reason, that otherwise, *There had not been any Church for many Ages past; and that indeed the Church* (he meant of *Rome*) *was the very Synagogue of Anti-christ.*

But to come to a fresh Instance now on foot, the *Pere Juvency* a *French Jesuit* has lately Printed a Book at *Rome* in Defence of the *Pope's* Power to Depose *Princes*: And the Unwillingness and Shifts of the *Jesuits* at *Paris* to disown him in this, and to disclaim that Doctrine fairly and above Board, shews that it is not yet quite extinguished in *France*, but kept in the Embers, as in the Reign of *Henry* IV. For all who Understand that *Order* of the *Jesuits*, know full well

that

that none of them dare *Print*, especially upon such a Subject, without the Approbation of their Superiors. However it is Plain by this, that the *Deposing* Doctrine is still Countenanced at *Rome*. And that *France* is not intirely free from the Infection. And though the Vigor of the present *King* has depressed it very much, we cannot say it is totally extinguished, or that there is no Danger of a Relapse, while the Authority of the *Pope* is so Revered as *Head* of the *Catholick Church*, and this Council of *Lateran* is still owned as truly *General* and *Infallible*. And the *Bishops* of *France* still take an *Oath of Fidelity* and *Obedience* to the *Pope*.

L. But that *Oath* is not Inconsistent with their *Fidelity* to their *King*.

G. Pray, my Lord, let me ask you, is not an *Oath* to be taken in the known and declared Sense of the *Imposer*, for whose Security it is taken?

L. Yes surely, for otherwise all such *Oaths* would be Equivocal, and no Security at all.

G. Then the Question will be, what the *Pope* means by the *Regalia* of St. *Peter*, and all the *Rights*, *Prerogatives*, &c. of the *Apostolick Chair*, as he calls his own, to which these *Bishops* are Sworn, *contra omnem hominem*, against every Man or Power in the World. For it is the *Pope* who imposes this *Oath*, and it is taken for its Security. And has he not sufficiently declared what he means

by

by it? Take it in the Words of *the Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris, in the *Appendix*, p. 44. where they say, *That by this Decree* (of the *Bulla in Cœna Domini*) *the Popes declare themselves Soveraign Monarchs of the World.* And this is no more than is given them at their *Coronation*, as you have it in the *Roman Pontifical*, where the *Triple Crown* is put upon the *Pope's* Head with these Words, *Receive this Diadem adorned with three Crowns: And know your self to be Father of Princes and Kings; Governor of the World: And Vicar upon Earth of our Saviour* Jesus Christ. And must not this *Governor* of the *World* have *Power* to *Dethrone* all petty *Kings* and *Princes* that are under him? Else how can he Govern the *World*? And the *Popes* think that this their *Soveraign* Power of Deposing *Princes* is fully Recognized to them in the foresaid *Canon* of the *Council* of *Lateran.* And no *Pope* has ever yet been brought to disown this Power. So far from it, that the *Pope* who most of any other Asserted this *Bulla in Cœna*, and set it up on High, causing it to be Affixed and Published, not only at the Doors of the Churches in *Rome*, but in the Field of *Flora*, that all might take notice, as you find at the end of the *Bull*, p. 37. *Appen.* And who practised his *Deposing* Power (the last in *England*) upon Queen *Elizabeth*, Absolving her Subjects from their Allegiance, and Commanding all

Accipe Thyaram Tribus Coronis ornatam: Et scias te esse Patrem Principum & Regum: Rectorem Orbis: In Terra Vicarium Salvatoris nostri *Jesu Christi*.

the *Catholicks* in *England* to pay her no more *Obedience*, nor *Taxes*, &c. I say this same *Pope* has been pick'd out to be *Canonized* for a *Saint*, the very last Summer, 1712, by the present *Pope*, with all the Solemnity and Requisites in the Church of *Rome* for making a *Saint*. And this present *Pope*, as well as his Predecessors, does, every Year, Thunder out the *Excommunications* of this *Bulla in Cœna*, by *Bell*, *Book*, *and Candle*, which, like *Dracansor*, cuts down *Friends* and *Foes*; for there never was a *Roman Catholick King* in *England*, or in any other Kingdom, either before the *Reformation* or since, but is *Excommunicated* by this *Bull*, and by the 24th Article, past the Power even of the *Pope* to Absolve him, unless he first Abrogate and Annul all the *Laws* of his Country which are contrary to the Tenor of this *Bull*. And this never yet was done, and I dare say never will be done, in any *Popish* Country in *Europe*; and there is not, nor ever was any *Popish* Country in any other Part of the World, unless you will except the late *Spanish* Plantations in *America*. And not only the *Kings* themselves, but all their *Parliaments*, *Councellors*, *Judges*, *Officers*, even to *Printers* or *Publishers*, or any whosoever that *either directly or indirectly*, *tacitely or expresly*, *Violate*, *Depress*, *or Restrain the Ecclesiastical Liberties or Rights of the Apostolick See and holy Church of* Rome, *howsoever and whensoever obtained*, *or to be obtained*, are all here together *Excommunicated*, as likewise all *Archbishops*, *Bishops*, and *Clergy*, who shall do the same

ſame, and all who ſhall preſume to attempt any Oppoſition or Contravention to any thing contained in this *Bull*, are left under the *Diſpleaſure of Almighty God, and of His bleſſed Apoſtles*, Peter *and* Paul, which is the concluding *Sanction* of this *Bull*. And here *Saints* muſt be joined with *God*, leſt His Diſpleaſure ſhould not be ſufficient. By all this it appears, That there is hardly any *Roman Catholick* in the World above the Condition of a Plow-man, who is not *Excommunicated* by this *Bull*. And here you ſee plainly the *Pope* aſſuming a *Temporal* or *Civil* Power over all *Emperors*, *Kings*, and *Princes*, Limiting them by Artic. 5. as to the raiſing *Taxes* upon their own *Subjects*, without his expreſs License; and exempting all *Eccleſiaſticks* from being any way *Taxed* by them. *Artic.* 18. Or being under their Power, even in *Civil* or *Criminal* Cauſes, as by *Artic.* 19. though it were *Treaſon*, *Murder*, &c. for which noble Principle *Thomas Becket*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* was *Canonized*, for Maintaining the Liberties of *Holy Church!*

Now, My Lord, I leave it to your ſelf, whether if you were a *King*, you would deſire all the *Biſhops* of your Kingdom to be under an *Oath* of *Fidelity* to another, who pretended an *Abſolute* and *Civil* Power over you, with Authority to *Depoſe* you, as he had done to ſeveral of your Predeceſſors, and would by no means be brought to Diſclaim ſuch his Power, but on the contrary, made a freſh Claim of it every Year, and of his being the *Soveraign*

Monarch of the *World?* Nay, he puts in his Claim for more, if more can be thought of, as it is Worded in the *Bulla in Cœna.* Artic. 24. *All the Rights of the Apostolick See and Holy Church of* Rome, *howsoever and whensoever obtained or to be obtained* —— *Howsoever obtained,* that is, You are not to enquire whether *Right* or *Wrong:* And *Whensoever,* that is, You are not to go back to *Antiquity,* or the *Institution,* or look further than the present *Possession,* which with him gives *Right,* when it is for him. And *to be obtained,* secures any new Acquisitions he can make, and all his future *Pretences.* This is like Swearing *Et cœtera's.* And now I think the *Plenitude* of his *Power* is sufficiently Guarded! And all this is included in the *Regalia* of St. *Peter,* and the *Rights* of the *Roman* Church, to which the *Bishops* of *France,* as well as of other *Popish* Countries are *Sworn,* if they take that *Oath* sincerely, that is, according to the known and declared *Sense* of the *Imposer.*

(21.) *L.* But I suppose this *Oath* must have been taken away, if that Model of *Church Government* had gone on which was proposed by the Parliament of *Paris* (and no doubt with the *King*'s Approbation) that a *Council* of the *Bishops,* &c. in *France* should be constituted by His Majesty to dispose of vacant *Bishopricks,* &c. and determine all *Ecclesiastical* Matters, without any Appeal or Recourse to *Rome.*

G. And it had gone on, but for the Success of that *Confederacy* formed by Pope *Innocent* XI. against

against the King of *France*, to Re-establish his *Supremacy* there. In order to which he sent a *Nuncio* to our late King *James* to invite him to be Head of that *Confederacy*. But he who had learnt no other than *French* Popery, absolutely refused, and opposed the Encroachments of the *Pope's Supremacy*, as appears plainly by his Concurrence with Monsieur *Barillon* the *French Ambassador*, then residing with him, to cause the *Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris against the Pope's Supremacy, hereunto Annexed, to be Translated into *English*, and Printed at *London* in the Year 1688, which was his last of Reigning here. And the *Pope* had this for his Excuse, that he could not otherwise have carried on his *Confederacy*, than by concerting the *Deposition* of King *James*. Who would not have agreed to the *first* of the *Articles* Sworn at the *Hague* by the *Princes*, *Allies*, and *Confederates*, in *February*, 1691, and Printed here at that time, *viz. That no Peace be made with* Lewis XIV, *till he has made Reparation to the Holy See, for whatsoever he has acted against it; and till he Annul and make void all those Infamous Proceedings against the Holy Father*, Innocent XI. These are *the Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris hereunto annexed. And in the Treaty of K. *William* with *Spain*, bearing Date *Dec.* 31, 1690. it is stipulated, *Art.* 4. *That all things in the Ecclesiasticks* (in *France*) *should be restored as in their former State.*

Now if King *James* would not come in to these things, was there not sufficient Reason

 for

for the *Pope* to exercise his *Deposing* Power against him, in the best manner that he could? And if he had such *Power* from *God*, then King *James* had no Injury to complain of as done to him, being *Deposed* by his Lawful *Superior*.

L. You recal to my Mind the Astonishment we were in here at the cold Reception, and even Slights put upon the Earl of *Castlemain*, Ambassador of King *James* at *Rome*, while a *Protestant Doctor*, no ways acceptable there upon his own Account, and some others, were Caressed in an extraordinary manner. But the Event of things explains their Conduct. And now we see the Reason why *Innocent* XI. was then called here the *Protestant Pope*, because he took part against King *James*, and helped on the *Revolution*. And I have been told, That at that time the *Pope* did require of King *James* his Promise to use his Endeavours to have the *Oath of Supremacy* taken away in *England*. And that His Majesty did positively refuse it, which some of us wondered at here. But that another did Promise it, and in this, was as good as his Word, and has taken this Stumbling-block out of the Way.

G. King *James* his Fate was very hard, he was Abdicated in *England*, because he was a *Papist*: And the Pope wrought his *Deposition*, because he was too much a *Protestant*. And such *Protestants* are the *French* reckoned at *Rome*, they are called there *Heretici Tolerati*, *Tolerated Hereticks*. Nor would they be *Tolerated*, if the *Pope* could help it; that is, if he durst

durſt imitate the Example of his Predeceſſor, the new Saint, Pope *Pious* V. to Depoſe the *Soveraign*, Abſolve the *Subjects* from their *Allegiance*, and *Interdict* the *Kingdom*. But that Experiment proved ſo fatal to the *Pope* in *England*, that it is not likely it will ever be tryed again, either in *France*, or any where elſe. The Thunder of the Vatican is ſpent, and become a *Brutum Fulmen*. The *Emperor* keeps *Commacchio* ſtill, notwithſtanding it is particularly named, by the *Latin* Name *Comaclum*, in the *Bulla in Cœna*. The 2d Article Damns all who Appeal from the *Pope* to a future *Council*: Yet have we ſeen it done in Form by the *King* of *France* and the *Parliament* of *Paris*, and that very *Bull* named, and thrown off without any Regard. And the whole *Gallican Church* are under this *Excommunication* in almoſt all the Articles of it, by the four memorable *Propoſitions*, here annexed, which were Eſtabliſhed in the *General Aſſembly* of their *Biſhops* and *Clergy* in the Year 1682, upon which the *Pope* refuſed his *Bull* to the *Biſhops* there, as is complained of in the *Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris, and was the Ground of their Quarrel with Pope *Innocent* XI. And the Learned *du Pin* wrote his Treatiſe before mentioned *de la Puiſſance Eccleſiaſtique*, &c. in Defence of theſe *Propoſitions* againſt all the Objections of the *Pope* and Church of *Rome*.

L. You ſhould have ſaid the *Court* of *Rome*.

G. I underſtand not the Diſtinction. If you mean nothing by the *Church* of *Rome* but a

General Council, then there is no *Church* of *Rome* now in the World, but if there be a *Church* of *Rome*, where shall we look for it but at *Rome?* And what is it there but the *Pope* and his *Cardinals?* And is not that it which you call the *Court* of *Rome*. Where then is the Difference?

L. We own the *Pope* to be the *First and the Chief of the Bishops*, and as such keep Communion with him, as it is said in the *Proceedings of the Parliament of* Paris, p. 51.

G. The *Precedence* of *Bishops* is not a Matter of that Consequence as to break the *Peace* of the *Church* for it, or which of them should be *President* in a *Council*. If that were all the Difference, the *Bishop* of *Rome* should have it with all my Heart, or any other *Bishop* they should agree upon. And if this were all that is meant by the *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, we should not trouble the World much about it. But he will not be content with any such thing. The *Supremacy* he claims is no less than an absolute *Soveraignty* over all the *Churches* and *Kingdoms* of the Earth, their *Bishops* and their *Kings*: And this not by any *Ecclesiastical* Constitution, or Grant of Temporal *Princes*, which might be Conditional, Limited, and Revocable; and would infer their Superiority to him: But by a *Divine* and *Indefeasible* Right, as Successor of St. *Peter*, and Heir of all the Promises made to him, *Unalterable*, *Unlimitable*, and *Unaccountable* to any *Power* upon *Earth*.

L. What-

L. Whatever he means by his *Supremacy*, we mean no ſuch thing, or other than that he is the *Firſt* or *Chief of the Biſhops*, and as ſuch, think our ſelves obliged to keep *Communion* with him.

G. But when he means one thing by his *Supremacy*, and you mean another, and he has ſufficiently declared what he means by it, and requires your owning it and *ſwearing* to it, for his Security. Who deal moſt ſincerely with him, we who not believing any ſuch *Supremacy* in him, will neither *own* it nor *ſwear* to it: Or you, who not believing it more than we, in the Senſe you know he means it, yet own it in General Terms, but in a quite contrary Senſe to what you know he means, and truſts to as his Security? We *Diſown* it, and Fight againſt it: You Fight againſt it as much as we, yet ſeem to *own* it.

L. But though we differ from the Pope upon the Point of his *Supremacy*, yet we keep *Communion* with him.

(24.) *G.* Is not *Excommunication* putting a Man out of *Communion*?

L. Yes, for ſo is the Word *Ex-communicate*, that is, to put out of *Communion*.

G. Can a Man be ſaid then to be in the *Communion* of a *Biſhop* who has *Ex-communicated* him?

L. No, I think not, elſe *Ex-communication* ſignifies nothing.

G. Then

G. Then none can be truly said to be in *Communion* with the *Pope* who are *Excommunicated* by every Year, in the *Bulla in Cœna:* And that is all *France*, and you, My Lord, and all who are on your side of the Question concerning the *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, for that is the Main, almost the only Subject of that *Bull.*

L. But all Casuists do agree, that an *Excommunication* does not bind, which is made *Clave Errante*, that is, where the Judge passes Sentence through *Mis-information*, *Inadvertence* or of *Malice*, *Self-designs*, or other Sinister Motive; in these the *Judge* has *erred*, and also where he has *exceeded* his *Authority*, and *extended* it to things that are not subject to it; in these Cases the Sentence is unjust, and will not be ratified in Heaven.

G. But who is *Judge* whether the Sentence be pronounced *Clave Errante* or not? And how far the *Pope's* Authority does extend: He has *Excommunicated* you, All of you, *as if each one were particularly named*, for so it is expressed in the *Bull.* On the other hand, you despise this *Bull*, and say, with the *Parliament of Paris*, p. 44, 45. That he has hereby *Excommunicated* himself! And so you have a *Head* of the *Church* who is *Excommunicated!* And so of every *Pope* who gives his *Sanction* to this *Bull*, that is, all the *Popes* in our time, and long before. And from whose *Communion* is the *Pope* of *Rome* Excommunicated? Is there any other *Communion* but that of *Rome?* Is a Person *Excommunicated* no longer a *Member* of the *Church?* And can he then

be

be the *Head* of it? These are Matters of no small Importance, no less than whether we are *Members* of the *Church*, or cut off from it? You are cut off, says the *Pope* and *Church* of *Rome*. No, says *France* to them, you your selves are cut off. And yet these Two *Churches* are the same! And is there no *Judge* in this Case? Is every Man left to his own *private Judgment*? How then have we been Teazed with that Question, *Who shall be Judge*? This answers all Objections with you; for begin at what Point of *Popery* we will, and bring Arguments never so Convincing, we are always stopt with this Question, *Who shall be Judge*? And so you refer all to the Authority of your *Church*. But when you Answer this as to your own Case, you will have Answered it as to us too.

If the *Pope* is *Supreme Head* of the *Universal Church*, he must have Power of *Excommunication* over all in his own *Communion*, that is, according to his *Scheme*, over all *Christians* in the World. And to dispute the Validity of his *Excommunication*, is a total Denial of his *Supremacy*, and setting up another *Supreme* above him. And who is that? Who is *Judge* whether his *Excommunication* is valid, or not? And by what *Authority* does he *judge*? It must be by some Authority *Superior* to that of the Pope. And so he is *Supreme* over the *Supreme*.

But if the *Pope's Excommunication* stands (without which his *Supremacy* falls) we may say, *who then can be saved*? All the Christian

Kings

Kings and *Princes* that are or ever were in the World, even those of his own Communion, particularly in *England*, as well before the *Reformation* as since, are all together *Cursed* and *Anathematized* to the Pit of Hell, by the *Bulla in Cœna*; and with them, all their *Bishops*, *Divines*, *Parliaments*, *Judges*, *Lawyers*, *Clerks*, *Printers* and *Publishers*, or any others who have any manner of way been Aiding, Assisting, or Consenting, though *tacitly*, to the Contravention of their *Princes* to any Part of this *Bull*, that is, as I said before, almost every one above the Condition of a Ploughman, are hereby all *Damn'd*, by all the *Authority* the *Pope* has. Therefore have a Care of giving him too much, for he will take all any body will give. He accepted this from *Bellarmin*, that *if the Pope should Command the Practice of Vice, and forbid Virtue, the Church were bound to believe Vice to be good, and Virtue to be wicked.* Nay his own *Canon Law* saith, That *if the Pope were so wicked, as to carry with him innumerable People by Troops as Slaves to Hell, to be with himself for ever Tormented; yet no Mortal Man whatever must presume here to reprove his Faults, because he is Judge of all, and himself to be judged of none.* So then they must keep their Reproofs, and not endeavour to stop the Career till they are with Him in *Hell*, for then I suppose his *Supremacy* ceases! Behold the *Machine*, of Humane

De Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 5.

Decret. part 1. *dist* 40. *can.* 6. *Si. Papa.*

mane Invention, which *God* never thought of, nor ever once mentioned, of Climbing to Heaven by a sort of *Mechanism*, upon a Ladder of *Popes*, *Cardinals*, *Councils*, &c. And though we see them leading us by Troops into *Hell*, we must give no Obstruction, because it would break the *Machine* of their being our *Infallible Guides* to *Heaven!*

(23.) *L.* But after all, if you could find an *Infallible Guide*, whom you believed to be so, it would give you much Ease, and be a Comfort to you.

G. But I must have some *Reason* to believe him to be such a *Guide*. And I could not be more sure of it, than of the Truth of that Reason upon which I did believe it. So that all Recurs upon my own *Reason* still. And if my *Reason* misleads me in this, it is the most fatal Delusion, because it stops all Methods of Recovery, when I have once given to another the *Dominion* over my *Faith*. But this the *Apostles* disclaimed, for when they Exhorted the *Churches*, they said, *Not for that we have Dominion over your Faith, but are Helpers of your Joy: For by Faith ye stand*, that is, by your own *Faith*. And *if we, or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, let him be accursed.* Did not this make them Judges, whether any New *Gospel* or *Doctrine* was Preached unto them? And our *Saviour* bids them stick to their

2 Cor. I. 24.

Gal. I. 8.

their own Judgment, and said unto them, *Yea, and why even of your own selves judge ye not what is Right?* And, *if I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not.* Was not this Appealing to their Judgment, whether He did the Works of His Father, or not? And as many as followed their own Judgment they believed on Him: But they who were tyed up *Implicitly* to the *Authority* of the *Church*, they rejected Him, they said, *Have any of the Rulers, or of the Pharisees believed on Him? But this People who knoweth not the Law are Cursed.*

Luke xii. 57.

John x. 37.

John vii. 48.

L. If a Man durst dispute the Methods of *Providence*, it would seem strange that God did not order it so, as that the *Church* should have first known their *Messiah* when He came, and have declared Him to the *People*, and then they all would have Believed on Him.

G. The *Apostle* says, *That the foolishness of God is wiser than Men.* And he gives the Reason in the Words following, why *God chose the foolish things of the World to confound the Wise, that no Flesh should Glory in his Presence, but he that Glorieth, let him Glory in the Lord.* And he applieth this to the Case we are upon, to the Revelation of *Jesus Christ* when he came: For if he had been Received upon the Declaration and Authority of the *Church*, We had Gloried in the *Church*, whose Authority,

1 Cor. i. 25.

ty would have been Prior and Superior to that of *Christ* himself, as being the Ground upon which we believed Him. But as the *Sun* cannot be seen but by his own Light, so *God* and *Christ* cannot otherwise be known; no Adventitious or Borrowed Light can shew the Original Light whence all lesser Lights are deriv'd, which, like the *Moon* and *Stars*, Disappear at the Presence of the *Sun*. So the *Church* disappeared at the Presence of *Christ*, who was known by His own Light only, *We beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth.* John i. 14. Here was no going to the *Church* to know which was He? Or if you had, she would have misled you. It would have been like going to the *Moon* to ask where the *Sun* was. The *Church* is the *Moon*, and the *Stars* are the particular Bishops and Doctors, and other Eminent Men; But *Christ* is the *Sun* of Righteousness, and He will not give His Glory to another.

L. But few believed *Christ* when He came, or in all His Life, for it is said, that *He was to the Jews a Stumbling-Block, and to the Greeks foolishness.* 1 Cor. i. 23.

G. The Stumbling-block to the *Jews* was the Authority of their *Church* against Him, as I have shewed. And the *Greeks*, that is, the *Gentiles*, could not till after the *Resurrection* of *Christ* have any Notion of the Oeconomy of our Redemption by Him. Nor was He preached unto them till after the

Vision

Vision of the *Sheet* to St. *Peter* Act. x. For the *Gospel* was to be preached to the *Jews* first, but when they Rejected it, leaning upon the *Infallibility* of their *Church*, then it was sent to the *Gentiles*. Who being free from that Stumbling-Block of the *Church*, received it readily, and now make up the whole Body of the *Christian Church* throughout the World.

Act. xiii. 46.

And this teaches us another thing, that is, That an *Infallible Guide* (supposing such a one) would not be an *Infallible* Assurance to us, unless we were *Infallible* too: For besides our not knowing Him, or mistaking another for Him, for there has been *False Christs*, We might Misunderstand his Doctrine, and turn it to quite contrary Purposes from what He intended. This was the Case in our *Saviour*'s Time. He was a Guide truly *Infallible*, and yet how few followed Him, notwithstanding all His *Miracles* and Heavenly *Doctrine*? Therefore while we are *Fallible* our selves, and lyable to Errors, and Mistakes, in vain do we Grope after an *Infallible* Assurance, otherwise than the *Evidence* of things makes them Plain to that Reason which God has given us.

The *Angels* of *Heaven* fell: *Adam* fell from his Innocency. And the Seven *Bishops* who were the Seven *Stars* in the Right Hand of *Christ*, and the Seven *Golden Candlesticks*, the Seven *Churches* in the midst of which He walked, these all are *Fallen*;

Rev. i. 20.

Fallen; and what are We that we expect *Infallibility*? What *Bishop*, what *Church* now is so *Infallibly* Seated as these beloved *Seven* were? What *Church* has a Promise of being Exempted from that General *Defection* which is foretold will be before the *Second Coming* of *Christ*, when He shall not find Faith upon the Earth? Or may we not rather think, that the Plea of *Infallibility* in the Church of *Rome* (so many ways Detected) which hides Repentance from her Eyes, and hinders her to Return from any of her Errors, which by this means continually Flow without any Ebbing on any Side, I say, May we not think this always Increasing Corruption the chief Cause to bring on that Universal *Defection* in the latter times? Does it not seem to hasten apace, to be even at the Doors, when we see no *Absurdity* so Great, no *Text* of *Scripture* so Full and Express, to be too hard for this *Infallibility*? Not the Denying of all our outward *Senses* at once, and owning that we neither *See*, *Hear*, *Feel*, *Taste*, nor *Smell*! Not the express Institution of the *Lord's Supper* in *both Kinds*, to which the Council of *Constance* claps a *Non Obstante*, and takes away the *Cup* from the *Laity*! Not the Authority and Strong Reasoning of the *Apostles*, 1 Cor. xiv. against *Publick Prayer* in an *Unknown Tongue*! All these are Over-Ruled by *Infallibility*! And many more we have to Instance in the particular *Doctrines* in Dispute with the Church of *Rome*: In

all which, by Vertue of her *Unlimited* and *Infallible* Power of *Interpretation*, she leaves no *Text* of *Scripture* of any Meaning, other than she thinks fit to put upon them, let the Words be never so Express. And this indeed is no other than taking the *Scriptures* wholly from us, while we must not Read them with our own Understanding. And the Result of this, is, That the whole *Foundation* of our *Faith* is in the *Church* of *Rome*, without *Scripture* or any thing else, because the *Scripture* and every thing else is put *Absolutely* and *Implicitly* in her Power. And yet no Man alive knows what this *Church* of *Rome* is, or where to be found? I mean that *Church* of *Rome* to which the *Infallibility* is annexed. For if you travel to *Rome*, you will see nothing there but what, by a Modern Distinction, you call the *Court* of *Rome*. Where then is this Infallible *Church* of *Rome*? Some place it in the *Pope* alone, as the only Heir of St. *Peter*, and *Living Judge* of Controversy, and therefore above all *Councils*, and the whole *Body* of the *Church* put together: Others like not this, and because some *Popes* have proved *Heretical*, and have been *Censured* and *Deposed* for it; and others of them have proved most *Wicked* and *Flagitious* Men, who besides the Viciousness of their own *Lives*, have filled the World with *Blood*, *Rebellions*, and *Usurpations*, in pursuance of the *Deposing* Power they have assumed over *Princes*; for these and other Reasons, they would

would not have the *Infallibility* trusted with the *Pope*, but lodge it in a *General Council*, as Superior to the *Pope*, with Power to *Reform* and even to *Depose* him: A *Third* Party approve of neither of these ways, for as they think the *Pope* alone without a *Council*, not to be *Infallible*, so neither the *Council* without the *Pope*, who is the *Head* of it, and without whom there cannot be a Lawful *Council*, as not a *Parliament* without the *King*, these are for *King* and *Parliament*, and place the *Supremacy* and *Infallibility* in neither *Pope* nor *Council* apart, but only when both together and agreeing; but because this will Defeat several of those *Councils* called *General*, and split others, as when the *Pope* or his *Legats* withdrew from the *Council* (like a *King* leaving his Parliament) then such was no longer a *Lawful Council*, but a *Schismatical Conventicle*, as was said of the *Councils* of *Constance* and *Basil*, &c. and because there have been *Popes* against *Popes*, and *Councils* against *Councils*; and that the Requisits necessary to Constitute a *Lawful Council* and consequently *Infallible*, or some of them Disputed, as the *Authority* of *Summoning* and *Convening* the *Council*, and *Presiding* in it; and other Requisites allowed by all to be Necessary, are Impossible to be known with any Certainty, as, That all the *Fathers* there met should use all Diligence to Examine and Canvass to the bottom every Point that comes before them; and that

they ſhould be under no Terror or Fear of any, nor Byaſſed by Party, hopes of Preferment or Gain, or any other Corrupt Paſſion, but doing all things out of true Zeal to the Glory of *God*, and good of the *Church*; otherwiſe that there is no *Infallibility* follows that *Council*; and this being Impoſſible for any to know but *God* alone, conſequently the *Infallibility* of all *Councils* is rendered Precarious, and no Certainty at all in them; or rather it is Certain, by the Hiſtories of all *General Councils*, that theſe Humane Paſſions, not Conſiſtent with *Infallibility*, had an Influence in all or moſt of them; ſo that we cannot be Certain of the *Infallibility* of any *Council*, unleſs we are Infallibly Sure that none of theſe Humane Paſſions had a Mixture in it: This makes a *Fourth* Party in the *Church* of *Rome*, that is, of thoſe who place the *Infallibility* neither in *Pope* nor *Council*, Jointly or Severally, but in the *Church Militant*, as they ſpeak, that is, the Church *Diffuſive*, or all *Churches* up and down the World. We muſt then Travel and Learn. Here is a wide Mark, and we are plainly left at laſt to our own *private Judgment*, to Collect and Compare, to Approve or Reject what we find Scattered in all the Diſtant *Churches* upon Earth. And no Man's Life or Capacity will be Sufficient to make the Inquiry, in any tollerable Meaſure.

And now, My Lord, which of theſe *Four* Sorts of *Infallibility* will you take? There are

Three

Three to One against you, choose which you will. And all these are of the *Church* of *Rome*. And what Difference is ther betwixt having no Guide, or one you cannot find?

L. If I cannot find him, I have him not; and that is all one as to have None.

Miserable Man! If he has no *Infallible Guide*, and is *Fallible* himself; and yet upon his going Right depends his Eternal either Happiness or Misery.

(24.) *G.* You may as well find fault with the *Creation*. *Shall the Clay say to the Potter, why hast thou made me thus?* Who was Guide to the *Angels* that fell? Who was Guide to *Adam*? Who was, or who is, Guide to all the Earth? To the *Heathens*, to *Mahometans*, to *Jews*? These last stick to their *Church*, as an *Infallible Guide*, and therefore are most Obstinate, and the most Inveterate Enemies to *Christianity*. Who is Guide to *Infants* and to *Idiots*? And shall we Interrogate the *Almighty* what he will do with these, or why He Created them? And perhaps the greatest Part of Mankind Die before they come to the Years of Discretion: And when they are of Age, how few are Capable to Judge, or have Opportunity or Capacity to Examine the different Pleas betwixt *Church* and *Church*, *Religion* and *Religion*? And do we not see the Generality of the World take up their *Church* and *Religion* just according to their

Education? My Lord, if you and I had been Born and Bred in *Turky*, We might have been *Mahometans*.

L. Is *Religion* then nothing but a *Chance*, according to the Place we are Born in or where we receive our *Education*?

G. No, My Lord, *Truth* is *Truth*, though all the World should depart from it. And ther have been Converts in all Nations and Religions. But none where Men cannot be persuaded to overcome the Prejudice of Education, and Examine Impartially for themselves. But *Infallibility* barrs all Examination, for that Implies a Doubt, and brings us to *private Judgment*, and where then shall we Wander? And yet you must apply to every Man's *private Judgment* when you would make him a Convert to your *Church*, why else do you Argue or Reason with him? Must he not then Examine all the Arguments and Motives you give him for the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, and Judge for himself whether they are well Grounded, and will bear the Test of *Reason*? Or must every body have *Reason* and *Examine* but your selves? Believe it then you are in the most Dangerous Condition of any. And you are the Men who receive your *Religion* by *Chance*, just according to your *Education*. Suppose another should Return your own Answer to you, and say, I will not *Examine*, I am *Infallibly* Sure, and I will hear no more: What would you think of such a Man? Every *Enthusiast* will

tell

tell you the same. He will take his *Oath* that he is *Infallible!* And will hear no more than the *deaf Adder* the *Charms* of *Reason*; but he will bid you Silence your *Reason*, for that is it which blinds you, though *Solomon* calls it the *Lamp of God*, which He hath planted in our Heart, *Prov.* xx. 27. This is the *Image of God* in which He created us, and will be our Judge and Witness in the last Day, as it is given us for our Guide here. But instead of Trimming this *Lamp*, to make it burn clearly, we hear the General Cry from your Side, *Put it out* —— *Put it out* —— We cannot deal with you till that *Lamp* be Extinguished, it Thwarts us every Turn, and Starts a hundred Objections, that we cannot Believe peaceably for it. But when it is quite taken away (if that were possible to be done) then you offer to shew us a *Meteor* of *Infallibility* (about which your selves are not Agreed, nor know where to find it) which will keep us from ever *Doubting* any more. As when a Man's *Eyes* are put out, he cannot see a *Dirty Step* or a *Precipice* before him, and then he is in that State of *Security* you propose.

L. You see how this Guide of yours, this *Lamp* of *Reason* has mis-led the Nations; for *Heathens*, *Mahometans*, &c. all plead *Reason*.

G. And we have no other Method with them than to *Reason* on still with them, and Shew them that *Reason* is of our Side. And vast Multitudes of them have been thus Converted, even all the *Christian Churches* now in

the World; for all of them are of the *Gentiles*. And for those who yet remain Unconverted, or have not had the *Gospel* sufficiently proposed to them, we must leave them to *God* Who made them, and will Require from no Man more than He has given him, but will Judge all People Righteously. Of this I have spoke before.

(25.) But I observe that since this Notion of *Infallibility* came in to the *Church* of *Rome*, it has Rooted out all *Charity*, and her *Religion* has been chiefly Employed in *Cursing* and *Damning* all the World but her self. Her *Canons* are tagged with *Anathemaes* upon every Occasion, and you hear little in them of who shall be *Saved*, but every Page is full of who must be *Damned*. And the *Bulla in Cœna* pins the Basket, and leaves very few to Escape, even of the *Roman Communion* it self.

It is a Common Argument with which your *Priests* frighten *Women* and *Children*, viz. *You* Protestants *say it is possible for a* Papist *to be saved: But we* Papists *say, it is impossible for a* Protestant *to be Saved: Therefore it is safer being of our Side.* But this has turned to their Confusion, for as ther is nothing in it but a confident *Averring*, it shews that they have no *Charity*, which is Greater even than *Faith* it self, 1 *Cor.* xiii. 13. And therefore that they can be no *Christian Church*: Their Want of *Charity* being by this much plainer than our Want of *Faith*. Take *Chillingworth*'s Answer to this, *Chap.* vii.

of

of his Works, *p.* 306. " You (*says he to* Knot *the* Jesuit) " vainly pretend, *that all Roman* " *Catholicks, not one excepted, profess that Pro-* " *testancy unrepented destroys Salvation.* From " which Generality we may except Two at least " to my Knowledge, and these are, Your self, " and *Franciscus de Sancta Clara*, who assures us, " that Ignorance and Repentance may excuse " a *Protestant* from Damnation, tho' Dying in " his Error. And this is all the Charity, which " by your own Confession also, the most fa- " vourable *Protestants* allow to *Papists.*

Militiere was persuaded that King *Charles* I. was Happy in Heaven, because he preferred the *Catholick* Faith before his Crown, his Liberty, his Life. [Now it is known to all the World that King *Charles* I. lived and dyed in the Communion of the *Church* of *England*, which he declared with his last Breath upon the Scaffold.] But Arch-Bishop *Bramhal* gave him this Answer, " That which you have con- " fessed here concerning King *Charles*, will spoil " your former Demonstration, *That the Prote-* " *stants have neither Church nor Faith.* But you " confess no more here than I have heard some " of your famous *Roman* Doctors at *Paris* ac- " knowledge to be true in General; and no more than that which the Bishop of *Chalcedon* (a Man that cannot be suspected of Partiality on our " Side) hath Affirmed and Published in Two of " his Books to the World in Print. That *Pro-* " *testantibus credentibus*, &c. *Persons living in* " *the Communion of the Protestant Church, if*

" *they*

" *they endeavour to learn the Faith, and are not* " *able to attain unto it; but hold it implicitly in* " *the Preparation of their Minds, and are ready* " *to Receive it when God shall be pleased to Re-* " *veal it* (which all good *Protestants* and all " good *Christians* are) *they neither want Church,* " *nor Faith, nor Salvation.*

L. Militiere supposed that King *Charles* I. Secretly and Invisibly in the Last Moments of his Life, was by God's Spirit United to the *Roman Catholick* Church.

G. Then no *Protestant*, at least no *Protestant King* need Despair——But to these Divines let us add some Royal Testimonies. King *James* I. in his *Præmonition to Christian Monarchs* tell us, That his Mother (Queen *Mary*) as she was ready to lay her Head upon the Block, sent him this Message; *That although she was of another Religion than that wherein he was brought up, yet she would not press him to change, except his Conscience forc'd him to it; not doubting but if he led a good Life, and were careful to do Justice and Govern well, he would be in a Good Case in his own Religion.*

This was perfectly agreeable to the Sentiments of his Grandson the late King *Jam.* II. who often spoke to those Divines who had the Instruction of both his Daughters, to be Diligent in making them Religious and Good *Christians*, in the Way of the Church of *England*, without so much as hinting at any Change of their Principles towards the Church of *Rome*, as I have heard my self from Two

of

of them, Dr. *Turner* late Lord Bishop of *Ely*, and Dr. *Ken* late Lord Bishop of *Bath* and *Wells*. And neither before nor after his coming to the Crown would he suffer any Attempt to be made upon them as to *Religion*, of which there is an eminent Witness now alive, who knows if I speak Truth. And when a certain Zealot pressed him to endeavour their Reconciliation to the Church of *Rome*, and offered his Service for the purpose, the *King* answered, *No, let them alone, they are so Good they will be Saved in any Church.*

L. It is strange then he should be a *Roman Catholick* himself.

G. Not at all, for he might think that best for him, without thinking those in hazard who were sincerely of the *Church* of *England*, and lived up to the Rules of it.

L. He could not think it lawful to be present at your *Common Prayers*.

G. He did not think it Unlawful, because he heard them at his *Coronation*.

L. That was upon a particular Occasion. But does any *Roman Catholick* think it Lawful to hear them Constantly or Frequently?

(26.) *G.* They did think so, for after the *Reformation* the *Roman Catholicks* of *England* came to our *Churches* and to our *Common Prayer* without any Scruple. And this continued till about the Tenth Year of the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, when Pope *Pius* V. forbad it by his *Bull*. So that he made the *Separation*, and if he had not sufficient *Power* to do it, or that

ther

ther was not sufficient *Cause* for it, then he made the *Schism* too, and it lies wholly at his Door. Now it is the undoubted Right of every *National Church* to Reform, Alter, and Model their *Liturgy* as shall be most Convenient, provided there be nothing put into it that is contrary to the *Faith*, which is not so much as Alledged against our *Publick Offices*. They have a *Breviary* at *Milan* and in other Places, different from that at *Rome*. And in *England* before the *Reformation* ther were Divers in several Dioceses, as what was used in the Church of *Salisbury*, of *Hereford*, of *Bangor*, of *York*, of *Lincoln*, &c. as is mentioned in the *Preface* to our *Common-Prayer Book*, *concerning the Service of the Church*. But these Differences did not break *Communion*, nor did the Alteration made at the *Reformation*, till the *Pope* by the Plenitude of his *Supremacy*, and to be Revenged upon Queen *Elizabeth*, took upon him to break the *Communion*. For which as ther was no Sufficient *Cause*, our *Liturgy* being all *Orthodox*, even our Enemies being Judges; so on the other hand, the *Pope's Supremacy* did not extend to break in upon the Rights and Liberties of any *National Church*, as has been and is still Maintained by the whole *Gallican* Church, and others the most Learned in the Church of *Rome*. And my Lord, I know some *Roman Catholicks* of Figure and good Sense in *England*, who meerly upon this Account have come over to our Church, and thought themselves Obliged to Return to the

Communion

Communion of their *National Church*, and to heal the Breach made by that Excess of the *Pope's Supremacy*, which no sober Man on this Side the *Alps* will own. It is strange to Own it in *Fact*, and yet deny it in *Words*. Whoever own this *Bull* of *Pius* V. for breaking *Communion* in *England*, must also own the full Extent of the *Bulla in Cœna*, which has his Authority, in a particular Manner, as well as of all the *Popes* since. And it Damns almost all the *Papists*, as well as all who are not *Papists*.

(27.) *L.* We desire not to be called *Papists*, we think it a Word of Contempt, as if we were only Partisans for the *Pope*, and of that Party or Faction of *Christians* who would Raise his Power above the *Church* and every thing else.

G. I am glad Your Lordship thinks so, and indeed the Church of *France* (where you were Bred) are not *Papists* in this Sense. They are got free, in a good Measure from the Servitude of the *Pope*. But they are still *Roman Catholicks*.

L. We do not delight in that Word neither, as if our *Catholicism* were tyed only to *Rome*; we term our selves *Catholicks* in General, as Members of the *Catholick* or *Universal* Church.

G. We call our selves so too, and in the same Sense, and Pray every Day for the *Catholick Church* in our Liturgy. Therefore we call not you *Catholicks*; because it would not Distin-

guish

guish *you* from *us*. But *Roman Catholicks* is calling a Part the Whole.

L. You know the Meaning, not that the Particular *Church* of *Rome* is all the *Churches* in the World, but she is called *Catholick*, as being the *Head* and *Principle of Unity* and *Communion* to all other *Churches*.

G. If this be the Frame of the *Catholick Church*, it must have been so always.

L. Yes surely, for ther was always a *Catholick Church*, that is, some particular Church, so called, in the same Sense as *Rome* is now.

G. Pray then, My Lord, tell me what Particular *Church* was so called, in this Sense, before there was a *Christian* in *Rome*? And how came that *Church* to lose it? And how was it transferred to *Rome*?

Every *Bishop*, every *Church*, and every *Member* of it, may be called *Catholick*, and were so called, as being included in the General Notion of the *Catholick Church*; but in the Sense you have Mentioned, as *Head* and *Principle of Unity* to all *Churches*, no *Bishop* or *Church* ever had it, till taken up in the latter times by the Bishop and *Church* of *Rome*.

(28.) *L.* But how came the *Bishop* of *Rome* to that great Sway he has long obtained in the *Church*?

G. It is very Obvious, because *Rome* was the *Metropolis* of the *Empire*: And consequently her *Bishop* must be more Conspicuous than any other, have more Respect pay'd him, and more

Applications

Applications made to him, especially after the *Emperors* became *Christian*: And for the same Reason, when the *Seat* of the *Empire* was translated to *Constantinople*, the *Bishop* of that *Church* took upon him, and Aspired further to an *Universal Supremacy*, but was Opposed by *Gregory* the Great, Bishop of *Rome*. Ther was no other Consideration then for the Superiority of one Bishop or Church, but the Secular Dignity of the Place; for which Reason the *Patriarch* of *Jerusalem* (which was Unconteſtably the Mother Church of all) was postponed, and made the Loweſt of all the *Patriarchs*. But for *Divine Right*, and *Christ* having Named any one *Bishop* or *Church* as *Head* and *Superior* to all others, there is not a Word. And it could not be *Rome* before *Rome* was *Christian*; and *Christ* never Named her upon any Occasion whatsoever, or gave the least Hint towards her, or that possibly can be applyed to her. Strange and Unaccountable! If he meant to Build the whole *Christian Faith* upon her, and to make her the *Catholick Church*, as Including all other *Churches* of *Christians*, and in all Ages throughout the whole World!

But, My Lord, *Fact* (as I said before) is the sureſt way to give us a true Light of Things. And the *Frame* or *Government* of the *Church* is a *Fact*, which must be Determined by *Histories* and *Records*, not Criticising upon *Words* that afford no *Certainty*. Let us look therefore into the *Frame* of the *Church* from the

Beginning.

Beginning. I hope I have made it Plain from the *History* of the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, that ther was none of them Appointed as *Sovereign* over the others, whatever *Words* may be strained in favour of St. *Peter*; for if he was called a *Rock* or *Foundation*, so were all the others, they are called the *Thelve Foundations* of the *Church*. Which is said to be *Built upon the Foundation of the Apostles, and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner Stone.* And not any particular *Prophet* or *Apostle*. And if the *Keys* of *Heaven* were promised to *Peter*, this was fulfilled in giving them to him Jointly with all the others, without any Mark of Superiority in him. As in the Commission to *Teach all Nations*, it was Equal to them all. And we find in *Fact* that it was Exercised by them all with equal Authority.

Rev. xxi. 14.

Eph. ii. 20.

Matth. xvi. 19.

Joh. xx. 23.

Matth. xxviii. 19.

And all the Regimen of the *Church* which the *Apostles* appointed was that of *Bishops* in their several *Districts*, without any *Head* or *Sovereign Bishop* over them all, as Supreme *Judge* of *Controversy*: Of which ther is not the least Title to be found in any of the Histories or Writings of those Ages next after the *Apostles*; though ther were many *Controversies* even in *Faith* among them, which an Appeal to this *Judge* had speedily ended;

ended; but no such thing appears, which could not have been missed had it been known. *Metropolitans* were Early, that is, the *Bishop* of the *Metropolis* or Chief *City* of a *Province*, who did Preside in the *Synods* of that *Province*, and had other *Ecclesiastical* Privileges granted him, by the Common Consent of the *Bishops* of the *Province*, for *Order* Sake, and greater Harmony of *Discipline*. But a *Patriarch* with Jurisdiction over several *Metropolitans* or *Provinces* was never heard of in the *Church* till the Council of *Chalcedon*, 450 Years after *Christ*. And many *Provinces* were not put under these *Patriarchs*, but had Exempt Jurisdiction of their own as before, of which *Britain* was one; for the *Patriarchat* of *Rome* extended only to *Italy* and the Isles adjacent. But the first Pretence to *Universal Supremacy* was set up by *John*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, after the Seat of the *Empire* was translated thither, against whom *Gregory* the Great wrote, and said that though his *See* of *Rome* had always the Precedence of *Constantinople*, yet that none of his Predecessors, the Bishops of *Rome*, had ever assumed such an Arrogant *Title*, which he calls a *Luciferian* Pride, and declares him who should take it to be the Fore-runner of *Anti-Christ*. And yet his Next Successor but One, that is *Boniface* III. did take it, being given him by *Phocas*, that Traitor and Usurper, who Murdered his Master *Mauricius*, the Emperor, and Seized his

Epist. Lib. ii. Ep. 32. 36. 38 Lib. vii. Ep. 30. 36, *&c.*

Throne, whom *Boniface* Owned and Abetted, and was made *Universal Bishop* for his Reward, in the Beginning of the *Seventh* Century. Thus the *Supremacy* now Claimed by *Rome* was Introduced, and has been Maintained *pro Viribus* ever since. And under this *Britain* has been subdued, which never was under the *Patriarchat* of *Rome*: So much has the *Government* and *Unity* of the *Church* been Altered from what it was in the *Apostles* time, or in the First Ages of the *Church*. And thus has *Rome* Usurped the Name of the *Catholick Church*, and placed all its *Unity* in Submission to her *Bishop*! Here we see the Degrees by which this Encroachment crept on; the *Patriarchat* began in the *Fifth*, and the *Universal Supremacy* in the *Seventh Century*. And *Britain* which held it out against the *Patriarchat* of *Rome*, was at last Conquered by the more Apparent *Usurpation* of her *Universal Supremacy*; so Obtained as I have told.

And yet I have heard some *Britains* say, That though they thought the *Church* of *Rome* the most *Corrupt* Part of the *Christian Church*, both as to *Doctrine* and *Worship*, and to be a *Cage* full of *Unclean Birds*; yet that they must be of her, and enter into that *Cage*, because she was the *Catholick Church*. This is like that Desperate Maxim in the *Canon Law*, I quoted before out of the *Decretals*, That *though the Pope should draw Infinite Numbers of People with him into Hell, yet we must not find Fault with him, nor Reprove him*, &c.

(29.) And

(29.) And I must observe also here; That though *France* has thrown off the Pope's *Infallibility*, and his *Deposing* Power over *Princes*, and has Limited his *Supremacy*, that is indeed taken it wholly away, for no *Supremacy* (properly so called) can be Limited, for then it Ceases to be *Supreme*: Yet *France* remains still in the Dreggs of the Corruptions of *Rome*, both as to *Doctrine* and *Worship*. The Religion of the People there, is, the Adoration of the *Host*, and of the *Cross*, Invocation of *Saints*, Worship of *Images*, praying Souls out of *Purgatory*, telling their *Beads*, and going to *Confession*.

(30.) *L.* I have heard your self say, that *Confession* was a good Thing, rightly Used.

G. And so I say still, But not in that Sense it is generally used with you, and is Expressed in your *Catechism ad Parochos, de Pœnitentiæ Sacramento*, Sect. 46, 47. That such a Repentance as God will not Accept, nor Pardon for it, is made sufficient by the *Sacrament of Penance*, and all our Sins Remitted by it. And that *Paucissimi*, very *few* can be saved without it. They might have said, *None*, for they here require in Repentance acceptible to God, a Sense and Sorrow for Sin that shall be fully Equal to the Demerit, *Ut cum scelerum Magnitudine Æquari conferrique possit*, which is Impossible for Mortal Man. And therefore All must be Damned without this *Sacrament of Penance*. And they

say; It was Necessary that God should Institute this Sacrament, as an Easier way for Men to get to Heaven. *Quare necesse fuit ut clementissimus Dominus faciliori ratione communi hominum saluti consuleret.* An Easy way indeed! *Confess* to a *Priest* and get *Absolution*, and this makes up the *Defects* of your *Repentance*, and you are saved *ex Opere Operato*, by the *Work wrought* the *bare Performance* of this *Sacrament*. And the Council of *Trent* Anathematises all those who say that the very *Sacraments* of the Gospel do not confer *Grace* in the same Manner, by the bare Performance. *Si quis dixerit per ipsa Novæ legis Sacramenta ex Opere Operato non conferri Gratiam——Anathema sit.* Sess. 7. Can. 8. It is true that God did Institute His *Sacraments* as *Means* of *Grace*, (for which we Bless His Name Daily in our *General Thanksgiving*) but this turns them into *Charms*, when the very *Sacraments* themselves, *ipsa Sacramenta*, confer the *Grace*, *ex Opere Operato*, by the bare Performance of the *Work*.

Let us Exemplify this to our selves by the like Use made of the *Institutions* of *God* under the *Law*. The *Jews* had got this Notion of the *Opus Operatum*, that the bare Performance of the *Letter* of the *Law*, in their *Sacrifices*, *Feasts*, *Fasts*, and other *Observances* was all that was Required of them. Whence the Voices of all the *Prophets* were against these *Institutions*, they call them *Iniquity*, *Abomination*, and

and *Hateful* to *God*: Nay, God denies that He did *Require* them, or ever did *Institute* them. That is, as a dead Carcass without a Soul, and Working like *Charms* by the bare *Opus Operatum*. God did never Institute such, nor does Require them at our Hands. And may we not say, no more under the *Gospel* than the *Law*? For the *Gospel* introduced a more Pure and Spiritual Worship, but the Council of *Trent* by Naming only the Sacraments of the *New Law*, applies the *Opus Operatum* to them also, if not Chiefly.

Isa. i. 11, 12, 13. 14. Jer. vii. 22.

What else is the Meaning of tying Men to the Repetition of such a percise Number of *Ave*'s and *Pater's* and *Credo's*, at such particular Times, whether the Mind goes along with them, or not? For you will see People in the Markets, buying and selling, or Discoursing of Common Business, and droping their *Beads* all the while, to keep Count if they have Rightly Performed their Task of the *Opus Operatum*.

But if *Prayers* and *Sacraments*, which are *Means* of *Grace* of *God*'s own *Institution*, may be thus Abused, and rendred Hateful to *God*: What shall we say of those *Means* of *Grace* which are of *Man*'s mere *Invention*? None can Appoint the *Means* but he who has the bestowing of the *End* to be Obtained by those *Means*: As if I have a Thousand Pounds to Bestow, I may put what Conditions I

think fit, and Appoint the *Means* for the Obtaining it; and none else can Appoint the *Means*: Now *Grace* is the Gift of the *Holy Ghost*, and none can Appoint the *Means* of Obtaining it, but who has the Bestowing of the *Holy Ghost*; which it is the Highest *Blasphemy* for any *Creature* to Assume to Himself; hence *Christ's* sending the *Holy Ghost* is a sure Proof of His *Divinity*: But the Church of *Rome* takes upon her to Appoint *Means* of *Grace*, many and various; the whole *Pontifical* is made up of the *Forms* of *Consecration* of every thing almost one can think of into *Means* of *Grace*, as *Bells*, *Books*, *Candles*, *Water*, *Salt*, *Oil*, *Ashes*, *Palms*, *Swords*, *Banners*, and *Vestments* of divers Sorts, even to *Childrens Clouts*, besides *Crosses*, *Pictures*, *Images*, *Agnus Dei's*, &c. By the Use of which, in the Manner prescribed, several *Graces*, both Ghostly and Bodily, are said to be Obtained, as besides the Favour of God, and the Remission of Sins, the Saving from *Fire*, from *Diseases*, from *Storms* at *Sea*, *Thunder*, *Lightning*, and *Tempest* at *Land*, at which times they Ring their Consecrated *Bells*, to Allay the *Winds*, and Chase away the *Dæmons* of the *Air*, who seeing the *Sign* of the *Cross* upon such *Bells*, and hearing their Sound, shall be *Frighted* and *Fly away*, as it is Expressed in the *Form* of *Consecration* of *Bells* in the *Pontifical*. Nay ther is Nothing in the World so Insignificant, a *Rose*, or a *Feather*, which the *Pope* may not *Consecrate* into a *Means* of

Grace

Grace, and is in Use every Day. And at *Rome* they are counted *Atheists* who have not Faith in these things. So much they Place their *Religion* in them!

L. The *Dissenters* Object all this to you, as to your *Rites*, *Ceremonies*, *Habits*, &c.

G. But without any Ground, for we *Consecrate* none of these things, nor do we attribute any *Vertue*, Ghostly or Bodily to the use of them, as to the Wearing a *Surplice*, hearing a *Bell* or an *Organ*, &c. they are purely for *Decency* and *Order*, and we may Change them, or take them quite away every Day, as our Governours think fit. Can they shew any outward *Action* or *Thing* appointed in our *Church*, by the use of which *Evil Spirits* may be Chased away, *Women* helped in *Labour*, or *Storms* at *Sea* quell'd; All which and many more Vertues are attributed in your *Church* to the use of what you call *Holy Water*, and many other such like Institutions of Mechanical *Means* of *Grace*.

(31.) But that which makes up the Bulk of the *Romish Devotions* is, the *Worship* and *Invocation* of *Saints* and *Angels*, the Adoration of their *Images*, and of the *Reliques* of *Saints* departed, Pieces of their *Bodies* or of their *Vestments*, &c. to which great *Miracles* are attributed, and therefore they are made, strictly and properly, *Means* of *Grace*.

L. We desire the *Prayers* of one another upon *Earth*, why not much rather of the *Saints* and *Angels* in *Heaven*.

G. Because the one is *Commanded*, the other not, nay *Forbidden*, as I will shew you.

L. It seems to be giving greater Glory to *God*, and more *Humility* in us, not to Approach His Presence directly and immediately our selves, as we do not to an Earthly *King*, but by the Introduction and Recommendation of some eminent *Courtier* whom we know to be in His Favour.

G. Your Simile will Halt on all Four, for *God* is nearer to us than any *Saint* or *Angel*; *in God we Live and Move and have our Being*; but the *Angels* and *Saints* departed are at distance from us, and we know not where to find them, or that they hear our Prayers, for they are not every where, That is an Attribute of *God* alone.

L. Therefore our *School-men* say, they see our Prayers *in Speculo Trinitatis*, in the *Looking Glass* of *God*.

G. Do they see every thing in that *Looking-Glass*? Then they know as much as *God*! But if not, then how do we know they see our *Prayers* there? And how will this sort with your Simile of an Earthly *King*, that the *Courtier* must go to the *King* to know what I desired the *Courtier* to Ask of Him.

Abraham

Abraham is *the Father of us all.* Rom. iv. 16.
And he was called the Friend of God. Jam. ii. 23.
Therefore it is likely that he saw as far into that *Looking-Glass* as another. Yet it is said, *Isa.* lxiii. 16. *That Abraham is ignorant of us.* And are not we as Ignorant of their State, and what Knowledge they have of us below? We are told that they have no knowledge of it. *His Sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.* Job xiv. 21.

L. It is said, that the *Angels* of *Heaven* rejoice over a *Sinner* that *Repenteth.*

G. That is when it pleaseth *God* to let them know it, or that the *Sinner* comes thither. But that they know of every *Penitent* upon *Earth*, is no where said, nor do I know it Asserted by any.

But instead of the School-Mens *Looking-Glass* and their vain *Philosophy*, if we would look into the plain Directions of Holy *Scripture*, we should settle our selves upon a much surer Foundation. See then what the *Apostle* says upon the very Case in hand, *Let no Man beguile you of your Reward in a voluntary Humility* (or being a *voluntary* in *Humility*, as our *Margin* reads it) *and Worshipping of Angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puff'd up by his fleshly Mind; and not holding the Head, from which all the Body by Joints and Bands having Nourishment Ministred, and knit* Col. ii. 18, 19.

together

together, increaseth with the increase of God. And after says, *ver.* 23. *Which things have indeed a shew of Wisdom in Will-Worship and Humility*——Here is a full Answer to all your Pretensions for this *Will-Worship* of *Saints* and *Angels*, for both go upon the same Foot. It is called, *Intruding into things we have not seen*, of which we are altogether Uncertain, and therefore Sinful in the Practice, by the Apostles Rule, *Rom.* xiv. 23. That *whatsoever is not of Faith, is Sin.* This was spoke in respect of *Meats*, but is much more so as to our *Worship* and Solemn *Devotions* to GOD——Your Comparison of Access to an Earthly *King*, is here called a *Fleshly* or *Carnal* Thought, measuring *God* after the Manner of *Men*——And the Result of this is no less than *losing our Reward*, that is, *Heaven*; for it is forsaking the *Head*, which is *Christ*, whose *Members* we are, and receive *Nourishment* from Him; not so from *Saints* or *Angels*; God has given *Christ* to Us as the *One Mediator between God and Men*, 1 Tim. ii. 5. But we have made to our selves many *Mediators* to Assist and Help *Him*, as if his Mediation and Intercession were not Sufficient. And we make more Applications to Them than to Him, or to *God* himself. You have Ten *Ave Maria's* for One *Pater Noster.*

And you have Multiplyed these *Saints* to your selves without Number, like the Heathen *Deities*, and New *Canonizations* are going on every Day. Every *Country*, *City*, *Parish*, and almost

almost *Person* have a particular *Saint* for their *Patron*. You have *Saints*, as they had *Gods*, for the *Sea*, for the *Air*, *Fire*, &c. for *Peace*, for *War*, for *Learning*, and all sorts of *Trades* and *Occupations*. St. *Christopher* and St. *Clement* are for the *Sea*, especially the Virgin *Mary* to whom the Sea Men Sing *Ave Maris Stella*. St. *Agatha* is for the *Fire*, and they make *Letters* on her Day to quench *Fire* with. St. *Nicholas* and St. *Gregory* are for *Scholars*, St. *Luke* for *Painters*, &c. And they have *Saints* for all *Diseases*, St. *Cornelis* cures the *Falling-Sickness*, St. *Roche* the *Pox*, St. *Apollonia* the *Tooth-Ach*, &c. And they have particular *Saints* for all *Beasts* and *Cattle*, St. *Loy* presides over the *Horses*, and St. *Anthony* over the *Swine*, &c. And they bring their *Cattle* to be Blessed by these *Saints* on their particular Days. And they Pray to these *Saints* jointly with *God*, a *Scholar* says, *God* and St. *Nicholas* be my Speed. And when one *Sneezes*, *God* help and St. *John*. And to a *Horse* if he Stumbles, *God* and St. *Loy* save thee, *&c.* And upon every Surprize they cry, *Jesu Maria*.

(32.) *L.* You should not compare these to the *Dæmons* of the *Heathens*, for they were *Evil Spirits*. And they called them *Gods*.

G. The Word *Gods* is frequently given in *Scripture* to *Angels* and to *Men* as *Ministers* of *God*. And thus the *Heathens* understood it, and supposed their *Gods* to be such *Ministers*,

Ministers, as *Æolus* to Govern the *Winds*, *Neptune* the *Sea*, &c. Therefore they called them *Dii Medioxumi*, Inferior Gods, as standing in the Middle betwixt the Supreme God and us, to Succor or Punish us, according to His Orders. St. *Augustine*, who knew them well, tells us what they Argued for themselves, they said, *We do not Worship Evil Dæmons or Spirits, but we worship those whom you* (Christians) *call Angels, the Powers of the Great God, the Mysteries of the Great God.* But St. *Augustine* answered them, That they must be *Evil Spirits* whom they Worshipped, because they Required *Worship* from *Men*, as the *Devil* did from our *Saviour*, which the Good *Angels* always Refused, and he quotes, *Rev.* xix. 10. xxii. 9. Where the *Angel* forbade *John* to Worship him. And the same did the *Saints* upon Earth, as *Peter* refused it from *Cornelius* and *Paul* and *Barnabas* from the Men of *Lystra*, &c.

Non colimus mala Dæmonia, Angelos quos dicitis, ipsos & Nos colimus Virtutes Dei Magni, & Mysteria Dei Magni. Augustin Psal. xcvi.

Act. x. 26. xiv. 14, 15.

L. But we suppose not that the *Heathens* had any Notion of the *Supreme* and *True God*, but that they Worshipped every one of their *Gods* as *Supreme* and *Independent*.

G. Some Men make *Monsters* of others, to hide their own *Deformity!* Your *Guides* have set up this Notion, to hinder the Parallel betwixt the *Heathen Worship* of their *Inferior Gods*, and yours of *Saints* and *Angels*. For ther

ther is nothing more Evident than that the *Heathen* did acknowledge the *One Supreme* and *True God*, though in much Ignorance and Superstition. St. *Paul* said that they *knew God*, that He was *Manifest* unto them, *even His Eternal Power and Godhead. So that they were without Excuse in their foolish Imagination, to change the Glory of the Uncorruptible God into an Image made like to Corruptible Man*, &c. And he told the *Athenians*, *Whom therefore ye ignorantly Worship, Him declare I unto you.* He did not preach a *false God* unto them, but they had blended the Worship of *God* with these Inferior *Gods* or *Dæmons*, which was their *Superstition*, for so the Word signifies Δεισιδαιμονία, the fear of these *Dæmons*, and it is thus rendred every where in the *New Testament*, which we translate *Superstition*, and so your own *Vulgar Latin*, Act. xvii. 22. and xxv. 19. And the *Latin* word *Superstitio* means the same thing, and is derived, as *Servius* has it from *Super Stare*, as being a fear of those Heavenly Powers who *Supra stant* stand over us, and so *Superstition* is *Superstantium rerum timor*. Others derive it from *Superstites*, that these *Devi ex hominibus facti*, Men Deifyed after their Death, are still *Superstites*, and the fear of them as such is *Superstition*; or *qui Superstitem Memoriam defunctorum Colunt*, Who Worship the Memory of these Dead Men.

Rom. i. 19, 20, 21, 22. 23.

Act. xvii. 23.

The

The Worſhip of theſe *leſſer Gods* is what is forbidden in the *Firſt Commandment*, which reſpects the *Object* of *Worſhip*, that no *Religious* Worſhip is to be given to any but to the *Supreme God* alone. The *Second* Commandment relates to the *Manner* of Worſhip, that is, by *Images*. But this your Church has hid from the People, and divided the *Tenth* into *Two* to keep up the Number, that the People might think they ſtill have the *Ten* Commandments. And it is thus in your very *Catechiſm ad Parochos*. But of this hereafter.

The *Heathens* had their Good and Evil *Dæmones*, as their Good and Evil *Genii*, but according to St. *Auguſtine*'s Rule, they muſt be *Evil Dæmons* who accepted the *Worſhip* of *Men*, which were all the Heathen *Dæmons*, therefore the Word *Dæmon* is taken in the Worſt Senſe, and tranſlated *Devil* throughout the *New Teſtament*, and what we tranſlate *the Doctrines of Devils*, 1 *Tim.* iv. 1. is the Doctrine of the *Dæmones*, or of the Worſhip of *Dæmones*, διδασκαλίαι Δαιμονίων, and a various Lection has it νεκρῶν λατρεύοντες, *who worſhip the Dead*. The *Dæmones* of the Heathen were their Dead *Heroes*, whom they made *Divi* by an *Apotheoſis*; as the *Pope* does *Saints* by a *Canonization*. But it is too Groſs to put it upon the *Heathen*, that they thought every one of thoſe *Gods* whom they Made was the *Supreme God* who made themſelves. They owned theſe to be *Leſſer Gods*, ond only the *Vertues* and *Powers* of the Great *God*; and they thought that they

they Honoured the *Supreme God* the more, by doing Honour to His Substitutes; and all their *Worship* was Ultimately Referred to Him. So that *He only was Worshipped in all their Gods and Goddesses; for they made him King of all their Gods and Goddesses.*

Hi omnes Dii Deaque sit Unus Jupiter. August. de Civit. Dei l. iv. c. xi. *Ipsum enim Deorum omnium Dearumque Regem esse volunt.* Ib. c. ix.

And the Common Appellation given to *Jupiter* in *Homer* is, Πατὴρ and Βασιλεὺς ἀνδρῶν τε Θεῶν τε, *The Father and King of the Gods as well as of Men.* And he represents Him as Commanding all the other *Gods*, sending them on his Errands, calling them to Account, and sometimes Chastizing them. He was called *Majus Deus*, the *Great God.* *Lucian* in his Dialogues brings in *Neptune* making Suit to *Mercury*, that he might speak with *Jupiter.*

But besides all these, we have sufficient Testimony in *Scripture* of the *Heathens* acknowledging the *One Supreme* and *True God*, *Nebuchadnezzar* calls him *God of Gods, and Lord of Kings*——*The most High God*——And says, *I blessed the most High, and I praised and honoured Him that Liveth for Ever and Ever, whose Dominion is an Everlasting Dominion, and His Kingdom from Generation to Generation. And all the Inhabitants of the Earth are reputed as Nothing: And He doth according to His Will in the Army of Heaven, and among the Inhabitants of the Earth: And no Man*

Dan. ii. 47. iii. 26. 29. iv. 34, 35.

Man can stay His Hand, or say unto Him, What doest Thou?

Ezra i. 2. vi. 10. 12. *Cyrus* calls Him the *Lord God of Heaven.* And *Darius* the same, in as High Expressions as any *Christian* could use, Dan. vi. 26. *The Living God, and stedfast for Ever, and His Kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and His Dominion shall be even unto the End*, &c.

L. It is Strange that when they Acknowledged the Great *God* so fully, they did not forsake their own little *Gods.*

G. No, for they did not think it Inconsistent to Acknowledge One *God* above all, and yet to Suppose that every Nation had its own *God*, or *Gods*, in Subordination to the Supreme *God*, and as *Deputies* under Him. This was their Notion. And they supposed that *Judea* had its own Tutelar *God*, as well as other Countries. Therefore the King of *Assyria* having Conquered it, sent to teach his People who went thither, *the Manner of the God of the Land*, to appease His Wrath who had Plagued them with Lions. But yet they forsook not their own Gods, for it is said, *They feared the Lord, and served their own Gods.* And they allowed the same Liberty to the *Jews*, who were not Required in any of their Captivities to Renounce their own *God*; but only to Worship the *Gods* of the *Nations* where they lived. And of these Tutelar *Gods*, they supposed one might be Stronger or more Powerful than another, and

2 Kin. xvii. 26. 27, 33.

and therefore they would Boast of their *Gods*, one *Country* against another; thus said *Senacherib*, *Who are they among all the Gods of the Countries, that hath delivered their Country out of mine Hand, that the Lord* (the Tutelar *God* of *Judea*) *should deliver Jerusalem out of mine Hand? Where are the Gods of* Hamath *and of* Arpad? *&c.* When *Moses* and *Aaron* told *Pharaoh* that the *God* of the *Hebrews* had met with them, he was not Offended that they had another *God* besides those which were Worshipped in *Egypt*; he took it as a thing granted, that every *People* had their own Tutelar *God*.

ii Kin. xviii. 34, 35.

This then was the Difference betwixt the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, the *Gentiles* thought it lawful to Worship the Tutelar *God* of any *Country*, but still in Subordination to the *Most High God*, as has been shewed: On the other hand, the *Jews* were Obliged to Worship the *Lord God*, the *Supreme God*, and *Him only*, and they were forbid to Worship any of the *Gods* of the *Nations*.

But this Sin they often fell into, they Worshipped these *Gods*, but still in Conjunction with the *Lord* their *God*, as it is said, they did *Worship and Swear by the Lord, and Swear by* Malcham. But *Samuel* told them, *If ye return unto the Lord with all your Hearts, then put away the Strange Gods, and Ashtaroth from among you — and serve Him only —— Then they did put away Baalim and Ashtaroth, and served the Lord only.*

Zeph. i. 5.

1 Sam. vii. 3, 4.

L. But it is said, that they had *forsaken* the *Lord.*

G. It is called *forsaking* the *Lord*, when we will not Obey His *Commandments*, but Worship Him otherwise than He has Required, and join others with Him which He has forbidden.

Ezek. xiv. 5. 7. He said, *The House of Israel is Estranged from Me, Separated from Me through their Idols; yet they come and Enquire of a Prophet concerning Me.* And again,

Chap. xxiii. 39. *When they had slain their Children to their Idols, then came they the same Day into my Sanctuary.* And

Jer. vii. 9. He says to them, *Will ye burn Incense unto Baal, and walk after other Gods, and come and stand before Me in this House which is called by My Name?* It is said,

1 Kin. xvii. 33. 34. 41. *They feared the Lord, and served their own Gods, after the Manner of the Nations.* But it follows immediately, *They fear not the Lord, because they do not after His Statutes*, wherein He Commanded them *not to fear other Gods.* And again, *They feared the Lord, and served their graven Images.* Yet this was departing from the Fear of the *Lord*, but not a downright Denial of the *Supreme God*, or throwing him off from being any more their *God*, and taking any other *God* in his Room as the *Supreme God.* No, But it was taking other *Gods* with Him, of which

Jer. xliv. 4. He says, *Oh do not this abominable thing that I hate.*

This

This was the First *Sin* against which *God* took Care to Guard in the first Commandment, *Thou shalt have none other Gods before Me*, or *with Me*. And for the Distinction that the Worship of Inferior *Gods* or *Ministers* of *God* is not here forbidden, we say, *Ubi Lex non Distinguit, ibi non est Distinguendum, Where the Law does not Distinguish, we must not*; for ther is no *Law* but may be *Distinguished* away. And this is exactly the same Notion the *Heathen* had of their *Dæmones*. And the Worshiping of these or Fearing them, is literally what we call *Superstition*. It is a *Means* of *Grace* which *God* has not appointed. Exod. xx. 3. 23.

L. But we have reason to Suspect that several of the Heathen *Dæmones*, or Men Deify'd after they were Dead, were Supposititious, and that no such Men ever were in the World.

G. Many such will be found in the Catalogue of your *Saints*. What think you of the *Seven Sleepers*, who Slept 362 Years, and thought it but One Night? What think you of the Eleven Thousand *English* Virgins, all Martyred together at *Cologne*; and the fine Legend told of them? What do you believe of St. *George* his killing the *Dragon*, and Rescuing the *King's Daughter*? As true as our Ballad of the *Dragon* of *Wantly*. Yet ther are *Days* kept for all these and *Offices* made for them, with Prayers to them, and to *God*, that we may be Saved by these their Merits. Ther are Multitudes of the like, which you will find, even to

a Surfeit, in the *Devotions of the Roman Church*, with their *Breviaries*, *Missals*, *Legends*, and *Authors* quoted at large. And can these Prayers be in *Faith*, to Persons that never were in Being, and for the Merit of Actions that were never done? This is a *Means* of *Grace* of our own Invention indeed!

Besides, many have been *Canonized* for Notorious *Crimes*, as our St. *Thomas Becket* of *Canterbury*, whose Merit was, that he would Exempt all *Ecclesiasticks* from the *Secular* Power, though even in *Civil* or *Criminal* Causes, which was called Asserting the *Liberties* of *Holy Church*, and it is fully Asserted in the *Bulla in Cœna*. But notwithstanding all these Authorities, it is a Wicked Principle, and dissolves all *Civil* Government, it Exempts from the *King*'s Obedience the *First* of the *three Estates* of the Realm, which has or ought to have the greatest Influence upon the People; and transfers their *Allegiance* to another *Soveraign*, which is the Highest *Treason*, by the Laws of all well Governed Nations, as well as by the *Laws* of *God*. Yet for Asserting this *Becket* was *Canonized*; and for not giving way to it, the *King* was *Whipped* by the *Monks* of *Canterbury*, to which he was forced to Submit, in those times of *Papal* Supremacy.

Such another was the Last Year's Saint Pope *Pious* V. the great Asserter and last Practicer of the Power of the *Pope* to Depose *Princes*; and who broke the Communion of the *Church* of *England*.

But

But ther is one *Saint* (truly so) of whom I have reserved to speak in the last Place, because of the Excesses of your *Church* in their *Devotions* to *Her*, bordering even upon *Blasphemy* to any Common Ear. No less than a *Canonized* Person St. *Bonaventure* has Published what he calls, *The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, wherein every one of the 150 *Psalms*, as likewise the *Te Deum*, and other most Solemn Adorations of *God*, are all turned to the Virgin *Mary*. *Rosaries* and Books of Devotion to Her are many, here is one translated into *English* for the Use of the *Roman Catholicks* here, intituled, *The Devotion of Bondage, or the Practice of perfectly Consecrating our selves to the Service of the Blessed Virgin. Permissu Superiorum*, 1632. It is Licensed and highly Recommended both to Clergy and People by the Bishop of St. *Omars*, with several *Indulgences* granted to those who shall Devoutly make use of it; wherein we offer up our selves, both *Souls* and *Bodies*, as *Bond-slaves* to the B. *Virgin*: Among whose High *Prerogatives* you will find this the *Sixth*, p. 32. *The Soveraign Dominion that was given Her, not only over the World, but over the Creator of the World.* This indeed might well Ground that Petition made to her, *Jure Matris, Impera filio. By the Right of a Mother, Command your Son.* And her being call'd *The Mother of the whole Trinity*, in the *Missal Polon.* fol. 237. In the *Primer or Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary*,

Printed in *English*, 1699. (and in the *Exposition* before it said to be of *great Antiquity*, *and Composed by the Church*, *directed by the Holy Ghost*) you will find many Prayers to the Virgin *Mary*, not only of *Intercession* or *Praying for us*, but to Grant us *Grace*, Pardon of *Sin*, and *Eternal Life*, in as full and positive Terms as could be asked of *God* himself. See the Hymn, *Memento rerum Conditor*, p. 34. And *Ave Maris Stella*, p. 53. And the Prayer to her, p. 59. *Under thy Aid* —— *Sub tuum Præsidium* —— which is taken out of the *Roman Pontifical* in the Office for Consecrating an *Image* of the B. *Virgin*, where we Pray for *Aid*, &c. from her self directly, without mentioning any *Intercession*. Nay, they *Bless in her Name*, which was never done to any Creature. The Priesthood was Ordained by God, to *Bless in his Name*. No *Apostle* or *Angel* ever *Blessed* the *People* in *his own Name*. But in this *Primer*, p. 16. You will see the *Priest* give the *Blessing* in these Words, *The Virgin Mary*, *with her pious Son*, *bless us*. To which the People answer, *Amen*. Here the Principal Part is given to the *Virgin*, her Son only Blesses *with* her, and she is first Named. But if she be not Preferred, yet she is here put upon the Level with her Son at least, and *Blesses* the *People* Jointly with him.

Deut. x. 8.

L. Why may not the Virgin *Mary* Bless as well as an *Angel*? And we find that *Jacob* prayed the *Angel* might Bless his Grand-Sons.

Gen. xlviii. 16.

G. That

6. That *Angel* was *God*, and so it is Expressed, *God, before whom my Fathers Abraham, and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all Evil, Bless the Lads.* This *Angel* was *Christ*, who often Appeared before He took Flesh. He was the *Angel* which Wrestled with this same *Jacob*, and Blessed him. He was the *Angel* appeared to *Moses* in the Bush, and said, *I am the God of Abraham*, &c. which no Created *Angel* could have said. It was He who Appeared to *Joshua* as *Captain of the Host of the Lord*, and said, as before to *Moses*, *Loose thy Shoe from off thy Foot, for the Place whereon thou standest is Holy*, which no meer *Angel* ever said. So that this will be no Precedent for *Blessing* the *People* in the Name of the Virgin *Mary*. Jos. v. 14, 15.

Epiphanius reckons the Worship of the Virgin *Mary* (not then so Rank) among the *Heresies*, under the Name of the *Collyridians*, who offered *Cakes* to the *Moon* as *Queen* of *Heaven*, which is the same Name they give now to the *Virgin*, and she is Painted standing upon the *Moon* her Representive. *Epiphanius* Observes that our Blessed *Lord* foreseeing the *Superstition* that would come into the World on Account of His *Mother*, treated her always at a Distance, never once called her *Mother*, no not upon the *Cross*, or by any other Appellation than that of *Woman*, Hœr. 78, 79. Jer. vii. 18. xliv. 19.

man, and checking her forwardness said unto her, *Woman, what have I to do with thee?* She is as little Named as possible in the *Gospels*, where *Christ* pronounces a Greater Blessing to those that hear His Word, than to the *Womb* that Bare Him: And she is not Reckoned among those who saw Him after His *Resurrection*. She is but once Named in the *Acts of the Apostles*, and that upon no other Account than that she with other Women, continued in the Communion of the *Apostles* after the *Ascension* of our *Lord*: But none of her *Acts* or *Miracles* are Recorded, though Abundance in the *Legends*. And she is not once Named, upon any Account whatsoever, in any of the *Epistles*. Strange! That this should be so forgot, which makes now so great a Part in the *Devotions* of the *Church* of *Rome*!

Joh. ii. 4.

Luk. xi. 28.

Act. i. 14.

But there is an Honour of an Extraordinary Nature paid to *Her* at the Head of all the *Saints*, in the Office of the *Mass*, where, before the Consecration, the Elements are Offered up to God in Memory of the *Passion*, *Resurrection* and *Ascension* of *Jesus Christ*, and for the *Honour* of the Blessed Virgin *Mary*, &c. *in Honorem beatæ Mariæ semper Virginis*. Did *Christ* then *Suffer*, *Rise*, and *Ascend*, for *Her* Honour? It was for the Honour and Glory of *God* indeed, but to thrust Her in or any of the *Saints* to share in this, looks a little too Familiar, and putting them, at least *Her*, near

upon

upon the Level with the *Almighty*, since more could not be said to Him.

And here we may see a good Reason why *God* would not have any Religious Worship paid to these, or any *Ministers* of His Kingdom, nor would be Worshipped *with* them; for he saw ther would be Encroaching, and coming nearer to Him than was fit for the Condition of *Creatures*. They would have a Share with Him. Nay that they might come at last to Advance these above *God* Himself, and Prefer the *Saints* even to *Christ!* As it has been said, *That Christ did nothing which St.* Francis *did not do, yea, that he did more than Christ himself.*

Lib. Conform. fol. 1149.

And now we see the Reason why your *Index Expurgatorius* would not have it seen in the FATHERS, that *God only is to be Worshipped*, for they have Expunged this out of the *Indices* of their Works, that they might not be found by the People, who might take Offence to see their Worship divided betwixt *God* and *Creatures*.

Adorari solius Dei est; Deleatur ex Ind. Operum *Athanasii* Indice Lib. Prohib. & Expurg. p. 52. *Madrit.* An. 1627. item ex In. Op. S. *August.* ibid. p. 56.

Was ther ever so shameless a thing done by any *Church* as to take upon them to Correct and Alter the *Fathers?* It is plainly to stifle the Evidence against themselves: And renders every thing at least *Suspected* that they Quote out of them. And the *Scriptures* had been

been *Purged* too, but that they are so Common in the Hands of *Protestants*, that it could not be done without manifest Detection. But how far they have gone towards it, by *Mistranslations*, *Adding* or *Leaving out* some *Words*, I have shewed already. But to pursue the Subject we are now upon.

(34.) Not only the *Souls* of the *Saints* in Heaven, but their dead *Bodies* or Bits of them, a *Finger*, a *Toe*, or a *Tooth*, or a Scrap of their *Cloaths*, a *Girdle*, or a *Book*, or any thing else that they used are *Worshipped*, and made *Means* of *Grace*, and great *Miracles* said to be done by them.

ii Kin. xiii. 21. *L.* Was not a Dead Man Raised by touching the Bones of *Elisha*?

G. Yes, God may work *Miracles* by what *Means* he pleases. But does this Consecrate the *dead Body* of every *Saint* to be a *Means* of *Grace*, and a Worker of *Miracles*? Many *Miracles* were Wrought by the *Rod* of *Moses*; Is every *Rod* therefore a *Means* of *Grace*, either Ghostly or Bodily? Or may we Consecrate any *Rod* to be such a *Means*? Nothing is such a *Means* to us but what God has Commanded and Appointed to be Done, as *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*. It is the *Institution*, not an *Example*, that makes any thing a *Means* of *Grace* to us. Else we might go and Imitate all the *miraculous* Actions of

Moses

Moses or of *Christ*, and call them *Means* of *Grace* to us, because so used by them.

But as to the *Reliques* in your Church, many of them have been notoriously Detected, and it has been found out, That the *dead Bodies* of *Malefactors* have been taken for the *Reliques* of *Saints*, and great *Miracles* said to be done by them. The same *Relique* of such a *Saint*, the *Head* or *Finger* is shewn in several Places, and each Contend that theirs is the Right, and each have *Miracles* avouched for them. Many Instances of this, with Vouchers undeniable, you will find in *The Devotions of the Roman Church*. How then can you Worship such *Reliques* in *Faith*? without which it is a *Sin!*

(35.) But not only the *Saints*, and their *Reliques*, but their *Images* are with you made a distinct *Means* of *Grace*; for in the Consecration of the *Image* of a *Saint*, it is said, That whoever shall Worship such a Saint, *coram hac Imagine*, *before this Image*, may obtain so and so, for which End the *Image* is *Blessed* and *Sanctified*. So that it is not enough to Worship the *Saint*, but if I do it *before such a Consecrated Image*, I shall obtain more *Grace* than otherwise. This makes the *Image* it self a *Means* of *Grace*, for there is *Vertue* there. Why else would it not do as well to Pray, and not *before such an Image*? Why else indeed are such *Images* so formally *Consecrated*, if there be no *Vertue* in the *Consecration*?

tion? And why do Men go Pilgrimages, or send Vows to *Loretto*, or any other distant Place, if they think ther is no *Vertue* in the *Image* there, more than in Forty of the same sort which they may have at Home? And the *Saint* Represented by the *Image* is as near them in the one Place as in the other; ther must be then some *Vertue* Communicated to one *Image* more than to another.

L. Then you are against any *Pictures* or *Images* of the *Saints*, or paying any Honour to the Holy Men departed.

G. No, My Lord, We are not so Stingy, We scruple not *Pictures* for *Ornament*, but not for *Worship*, or for Worshipping *before them*, as you speak. And we Honour the *Saints* departed, as far as we think Lawful, and, as we are verily Persuaded, as far as they Desire; since according to St. *Augustin's* Rule before mentioned, if they Accepted our Adoration, it would Prove them to be *Evil Spirits*. And then you are to Consider, that instead of *Intercessors*, as you hope for by your Worship of them, they will vindicate themselves, and become your *Accusers*. But in our Honour of them, we first take Care not to specify any particular Person as a *Saint*, but who is so Recorded in Holy *Scripture*; for we understand not *Canonizations* by *Men* who know not the *Heart*; in the next place, we limit the Honour we pay them by the Rule of God's Commandments, which we suppose most Pleasing to them. We keep

particular

particular *Holy Days* for the *Apostles*, St. *John Baptist*, St. *Stephen*, &c. We bless God for them, commemorate their *Vertues*, and pray that we may follow their good Examples. We have One Day for All the *Saints* in General, and another for St. *Michael* and all *Angels*. Thus we Honour them, and for this we bear the Reproach of our sour *Dissenters*, as if we were too much Inclining to *Popery*. You think we give too little Honour to the *Saints*, and they think we give too much! But we hope we keep the Mean. We abstain from the *Pictures* or *Images* of the *Saints* in our *Churches*, because they have been abused to *Superstition*, and to avoid Offence. But in Places not Dedicated to Worship, as in private Houses, we think them not Unlawful, more than the Picture of any Good Man.

Epiphanius was very zealous against having them brought into *Churches*, and tells *John*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, in a Letter translated by St. *Jerom*, that finding a Linnen Cloth hung up in a Church Door, (it is likely to keep out the Wind) whereon was a *Picture* of *Christ*, or of some *Saint*, he Tore it, and Ordered a dead Corps to be Buried in it. And he Lamented the *Superstition* he saw coming, by these *Pictures* and *Images* then beginning to Creep into the *Church*.

The *Abuse* of things, tho' otherwise Lawful, which are not *Instituted* by *God* for Standing *Means* of *Grace*, as *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, may justly take away the *Use* of them.

them. Thus the *Brazen Serpent* was appointed by God as a *Means* of *Grace* for Miraculous *Cures* in the *Wilderness*, and was Preserved until the Days of *Hezekiah*, but when they burned *Incense* to it, it became an *Idol*, was broke to pieces and called by a Contemptible Name *Nehushtan*, that is, *A Bit of Brass*. How much more Reason is there to Remove the *Pictures* and *Images* of *Saints* (which God never Appointed) out of our *Churches*, when we see *Incense* burned to them, and they *Worshipped* in your *Churches*, as *Means* of *Grace*. And yet there is no Evil in the *Pictures* themselves.

2 Kin. xviii. 4.

(36) But there is One *Picture* I think has Evil in it, and is Unlawful any where; and yet it is seen in your *Churches*, and commonly over the *Altar*, that is, the *Picture* or *Image* of *God* the *Father*, like an *Old Man*, &c. We are forbid to *Make* it, and then we cannot *Worship* it. See how positively God forbids it, *Take good heed unto your selves, for ye saw no manner of Similitude* (that is of *God*) *in the Day that the Lord spake unto you--lest ye Corrupt your selves, and make you a graven Image, the Similitude of any Figure, the Likeness of Male or Female*, &c. And again, *They changed the Glory of the Uncorruptible God into an Image made like to Corruptible Man*, &c.

Deut. iv. 15, &c.

Rom. i. 23.

L. Both these *Texts* are Quoted and Answered in our *Catechism ad Parochos*, upon the *First*

First Commandment, and the Answer is this; (a) That the Sin here forbidden is to Paint or Carve *Imaginem Divinitatis*, *A Picture or Image of the Divinity*, or of the *Divine Nature*.

G. Pray, My Lord, did you ever know a *Painter* or *Statuary* who Attempted to draw a *Picture* or make an *Image* of a *Thought*, or of a *Soul*?

L. No, for they cannot be seen. *Pictures* and *Images* are made for the *Eye*. How then can a *Likeness* or *Similitude* be drawn of what is *Invisible*?

G. And is not the Great *God* more *Invisible*; and the *Divine Nature* much more *Incomprehensible* even to our *Thoughts* or *Imagination*? *How* then can it be Represented to our *Eye*? I dare say, there never was a Man since *Adam* who would own any such thing, or ever had so foolish a Thought. No, but when they drew any *Picture* or *Similitude* of *God*, it was only meant to Express some of His *Attributes* or *Perfections*; as by *Fire* His *Purity*, by a Giant with Many *Hands* His *Power*, with Many *Eyes* His *Providence*, &c. And so you own that by an *Old Man* you only mean to Express His *Antiquity*. And will not this Excuse the *Heathen*, as well as you? See the same Excuse made by *Maximus Tyrius*, *Dissert.* 38. *Whether Statues were to be made for the Gods*? But here you would put an *Impossible* Meaning upon the *Prohibition*

(a) De Cultu & Invocatione Sanctorum. *Sect.* xxxiv. xxxv.

hibition of *God*, to make it of no Effect, and which will Excuse the *Heathens* as much as your selves.

L. Our *Catechism ad Parochos* (which is our *Text*) in the Place last Quoted, *Sect.* xxxiv. teaches us, That the *Heathen* when they made *Images* of *Serpents*, *Beasts*, &c. they Worshipped all these as *God*. *Hæc enim omnia tanquam Deum venerabantur*. And that the *Israelites* thought the same of the *Golden Calf*, for that they said, *These are the Gods that brought thee out of Egypt*, and therefore that they were *Idolaters*, because they thus (*a*) *Changed their Glory into the Similitude of a Calf that eateth Grass*.

G. It is very Absurd to say, That the *Heathen* thought their *Images* to be the things of which they were the *Images*. That was Impossible, for then they would not be the *Images* but the *Things* themselves. Who ever said, that a Man's *Picture* was himself? Though they are called the *Persons*, as when we look upon *Pictures* we say, *This is such a Man*, or *such a Man*: But if any should put it upon us, that we meant the *Persons* themselves, we must think them *Idiots* or *School-Men*, that loved Distinctions and Wrangling. *Maximus Tyrius* in the *Dissertation* before Quoted, tells us, that they had many *Images* of the same God, as of *Venus*, *Diana*, &c. and yet that they did not think there was more than one *Venus* or one *Diana*

(*a*) Psal cvi. 20.

Diana. Have not you Multitudes of the *Pictures* and *Images* of the Virgin *Mary?* And yet you say not that ther is more than one such *Virgin.* Now the *Heathen* Worshipped their *Images*, and if you believe your own *Catechism*, you must think that they took every one for *God*, for *Hæc omnia*, they worshipped all these as *God!*

And it is as absurd to think that they took that *Serpent* or *Beast* whose *Image* they made, to be *God.* Or if they meant not any particular *Serpent* or *Ox* (for Example) by the *Image*, they must think every *Ox* or *Serpent* to be *God!* But they were not so Ridiculous, as *Maximus Tyrius*; and all, as many of them as have wrote, will satisfy you. But that they made Use of their *Images* only as *Symbols*, which being *Dedicated* to such a *God*, they thought that this *God* would afford his Presence with his *Symbol*, and by it secure to them his Favour and Protection. How near your *Consecration* comes to their *Dedication* of *Images*, I leave to your selves to judge. But you put such monstrous things upon the *Heathen*, as they Disown, Detest, and Abhor. And yet you must do it, that your Case and theirs may not appear so very like.

But you must draw in the *Jews* too, else all this will stand you in no stead. And you have no Mercy upon them, you suppose them full as Ignorant as you have made the *Heathen.* They must believe that the *Golden Calf*, on the same Day they made it, to be the Great *God*

Who made themselves and all the World, and to have brought them out of *Egypt* long before it self was made! But the *Jews* will not let this go with you more than the *Heathen*. They were not quite so foolish. They had learned the Use of *Images* and *Symbols* in *Egypt*. And it is plain they did here Imitate it. They had seen *Osiris* worshipped in *Egypt* under the Figure of an *Ox*, from which they took their Figure of the *Calf*. And it was to secure *God*'s Presence among them, upon the Supposed Loss of *Moses*, by whom they had Received their *Law* from *God*, and Directions from *Him* upon all Occasions. But *Moses* had been absent from them 40 Days, and took neither Meat nor Drink with him, so that they thought he had been quite Gone or Dead, and that they should never See him more. And then how should they do to Secure the Presence of *God* among them? And they took to this way of an *Image* or *Symbol* of *God*, not that they forsook *God*, but to take Care that *He* might not forsake them. And they meant *His* Worship in that of the *Golden Calf*. Therefore they Proclaimed the *Dedication* of it, (*a*) *A Feast unto the Lord*. And that it was wholly for the Want of *Moses* they did it, (by whom they had found, by long Experience, the Presence of *God* Secured among them) they themselves gave the Reason: (*b*) *Up* (said they) *make us Gods which*

(*a*) Exod. xxxii. 5. (*b*) Ver. 1.

which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the Man that brought us up out of the Land of Egypt, we Wot not what is become of him.

Pray, My Lord, let me ask you, suppose it were made *Treason* to *draw* a *Picture* of the King, or to *Bow* to it: Would you venture your *Life* upon all these *Distinctions* and *Excuses* which are made for the *Pictures* of God? Yet we venture our *Souls* upon it, if it be a *Sin*: And though we think it may be Beneficial to us, as putting us in Mind of Him, or paying Respect unto Him.

Now by this let us learn how Dangerous a thing it is to make *Means* of *Grace* of our own Invention, and to think that by our *Consecrations* or *Dedications*, without Wartant of God's *Word*, we can secure his Presence with us, and Procure the *Grace* of Health or any Benefit either to Body or Soul. This is turning *Religion* into *Superstition*.

(37.) But the strangest Instance of this that ever was in the World is that of *Trans-substantiation*, a meer *School-nicety* which no Man alive Understands, and yet Transformed into an Article of *Faith* by the Council of *Trent*.

Christ said, *This is my Body*, but as to the *Manner* or *Means* how it was so, He said not a Word; whether only *Sacramentally*, *Figuratively*, or *Symbolically*: Or on the other hand, whether, *Substantially*, *Con-substantially*, or *Trans-substantially*. These are Inventions of our own, from our poor *Philosophy*! And yet about these

is our whole Dispute; which has Tormented the *Christian Church* in our later Age more than all the other *Mysteries* of *Religion*. Had we kept to the Words of *Institution* as *Christ* left them, and gone no further, there might have been various *Opinions* in the *Schools* concerning the *Manner* of the *Presence* of *Christ*, in the *Sacrament*; and they who had nothing else to do might have spent their idle Hours, and vain Distinctions about it: But it had never broke the *Communion* of the *Church*, if it had not been adopted into an Article of *Faith*, and made a *Condition* of *Communion*: And now we must dispute it. And the first thing I have to say is, That it seems very strange there should be any Dispute about it. For our *Saviour* was then fulfilling a *Type* of himself which was the *Passover*, and he kept to the same *Phrase* or *Form of Words* which was Customary with the *Jews* in their Celebration of it, only putting *Himself* in the Room of His *Type*, as instead of *This is the Paschal Lamb which was slain for us in Egypt*, He said, *This is my Body which is given for you*. And when *Moses* sprinkled the *Blood*, it was with this Form of Words, (*a*.) *This is the Blood of the Testament which God hath Enjoyned unto you*. Instead of which *Old Testament*, *Christ* said, (*b*.) *This is my Blood of the New Testament*. In which Words there is no Difficulty at all, for no Mortal ever understood these Words of Moses

(*a*) *Heb*. ix. 20. (*b*) *Matth*. xxvi. 28.

Jes in a *Trans-substantial* Sense, and why should they the same Words when *Christ* spoke them, following the very Form of the Words of *Moses*? This made it Familiar and Easie to the *Apostles*, who called many things *Hard sayings* which were not so Difficult as this, and yet Expressed no Wonder or Astonishment at these Words of *Christ*, which had been impossible for them not to have done, if they had taken them in the Sense of *Trans-substantiation*, for it was a new Thing never before Heard or Thought of in the World! To deny all their *Senses* at once!

L. I wonder you should stand so much upon this, you Object your *Senses* and your *Reason*, and yet you must give them both up in the Mystery of the *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, &c.

G. No, My Lord, I must give neither of them up, for I cannot believe any *Revelation* but by my *Reason*, upon the *Evidence* that appears for it: And my *Reason* tells me that there must be many things in the Infinite Nature which I cannot Comprehend, and therefore I acquiesce in the *Revelation*, being once fully satisfied of it. This I have Discoursed already; But for the other Point that of Contradicting my outward *Senses*, I think it an Invincible Objection.

L. Why? Must you not give *them* up too, as to the *Trinity*, and *Incarnation*?

G. Not at all, My Lord, they Contradict none of my *Senses*. Pray tell me, which of

them do they Contradict? Is it the *Sense* of *Seeing*, *Hearing*, or *Smelling*?

L. They are not Objects of *Sense*.

G. Therefore they Contradict them not. But in *Trans-substantiation* they are every one Contradicted. And I stand upon it, That since the Creation of the World *God* never Did or Said any thing which Contradicted the *Sense* of any Man. It would be Destroying the Certainty of every thing. *Miracles* are Appeals to our *Senses*, and without believing our *Senses*, we can Trust to no *Miracle*, and Consequently to no *Revelation*.

L. I mean not a general Disbelief of our Senses in every thing, bnt if a *Revelation* (you are satisfied is true) should bid you disbelieve your *Senses*, in such a Particular only ——

G. It is a needless Supposition, for there is no such *Revelation*. But if there were, if an *Angel* should Appear to me, and bid me believe that I saw Him, but not to believe any thing else that I saw of a hundred things I saw round about him; I should without more a do either believe that I saw the other things I did see, or if I must not believe I saw *them*, I should not believe I saw *Him*. And I take it as a Certain Rule, that we must either believe our Senses in *Every thing* or in *Nothing*. Had not the *Apostles* at the *Lord's Supper* as much Reason to Doubt whether it was *Christ* they saw, and that He spoke to them, as that it was *Bread* which they Saw and Eat? If you come once to *deceptio Visus*, it will go quite through, and

you

you cannot be sure of one thing more than of another; because the Fault is in the *Eye*, not in the *Objects*. So that if *Trans-substantiation* be true, there is nothing else in the World true but it!

And it is no small Prejudice to this *Miracle* of *Miracles*, and Contradiction to it self and to all other *Miracles*, and to Every thing else in the World, That it should be put upon us just for —— nothing —— but to Stagger our *Faith*, and make us Doubt of Every thing!

For if all the Benefits of the Death of Christ be Conveyed to us in this Sacrament, by a *Figurative* and *Symbolical* Representation of his *Body* and *Blood*, and that it be so instituted for this End; it is to all Intents and Purposes as Beneficial to us, as if we had Eat the *Flesh* of *Christ* off his *Bones*, or Drank the very *Blood*, that came out of His *Side*; which is abhorrent to think, and to Avoid which you call this an *Unbloody* Sacrifice. But how is it *Unbloody*, if it be Real *Blood*, even the self same *Blood* that was shed upon the *Cross*? Yet you your selves allow, that this must be taken in a *Spiritual* not a *Carnal* Sense, because *Christ* Himself said, speaking of this *Sacrament* (as you own) and to solve that *hard saying* at which many were *offended*, of giving them his *Flesh* to *Eat*, He made it easie to them by this Explanation, (*a*) *It is the Spirit that Quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing; the Words that I speak unto you they are Spirit, and they are Life.* May we not then take his Words in a *Spiritual* Sense?

(*a*) *Joh.* vi. 63.

L. But you would have the Words of *Institution* taken *Figuratively*, as when *Christ* said, *I am a Vine, I am a Door*, &c.

G. There is not one Man in your Communion but must own that the Words of *Institution are Figurative*, for Example, (*a*) *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you.* Here is first, the *Cup* for the *Wine*, by a *Metonymie*, called *Continens pro Contento*. Then the *Cup* being the *New Testament*, I suppose you will allow is another *Figure*. And it is another, to say *which is shed*, for *which shall be shed*, for his *Blood* was not then *shed*. This last *Figure* you have Boldly avoided in your *Mass*, where it is put *Effundetur*, *shall be shed*, instead of *Effunditur*, or *Effusum*, according to the *Greek* ἐκχυνόμενον. However the Two Former *Figures* stand Unalterable.

But to shew that the Words were *Figurative*, and that the *Elements* did not lose their *Nature* by the *Consecration*, they are called by their own *Names* after the *Consecration*, as the *Wine* is called the (*b*) *Fruit of the Vine*, after the *Consecration*. And it is called *Bread* which they Eat in the *Sacrament*. And we are called *Bread* because we partake of that *Bread*. We are *Bread* by the same *Figure* that *Bread* is *Flesh*.

L. We believe that there is no *Bread* in the *Sacrament*, but we are sure we are not *Bread*.

G.

(*a*) Luk. xxii. 20. (*b*) Matth. xxvi. 29. Mark xiv. 25. 1 Cor. 17. xi. 26, 27, 28.

G. You are no more sure of the one, than of the other. But see now the Arbitrarinesses of your Interpretation, when it is said of *Bread*, *This is Flesh*, that is so very *Plain* it must be taken *Literally*: But when it is said of the *Bread* in the Sacrament, *This is Bread*, the Expression is so *Obscure*, that it must be taken *Figuratively*! Is not this Destroying the *Meaning of all Expressions*, to take Words *Figuratively* or *Literally* just as you think fit, and contrary to the common Usage as understood in all other things?

L. No, it is not as we think fit, but as the Ancient *Church* and *Fathers* did Understand it. Here we Stick.

G. And to this we Appeal. *Tertullian* says, that *Christ* made the *Bread* His BODY, by saying, (a) *This is My Body*, that is, the *Figure* of My *Body*.

Origen says of it, that it goes into the Belly, like other Meat, and so into the Draught, but says he speaks (b) concerning the *Typical* and *Symbolical* Body of *Christ* in the Sacrament.

It was said of the *Body* of *Christ*, that it (c) *should not see Corruption*. But we know the *Sacrament* will *Corrupt*, therefore it is not the *Same*.

Theodoret likewise calls it the (d) *Symbols* of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*. And says, that

(e)

(a) *Hoc est Corpus Meum, id est, Figura Corporis Mei. Contra Marcion.* l. iv. c. xl. (b) *Hæc quidem de Typico Symbolicoque Corpore.* In Matth. c. xv. (c) Psal. xvi. 10. Act. ii. 27, 31.
(d) Τὰ σύμβολα τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Δεσπότου καὶ τυπικὰ [illegible]

(*a*) upon their *Consecration* they are Changed indeed, and made other things, but still remain in their own proper *Nature*, and *Substance*, and *Shape*, and *Form*, and are *Visible* and *Tangible*, as they were before.

And writing against the *Eutychians*, who said that the *Human Nature* of *Christ* was Absort or Swallowed up in His *Divinity*, so that their Remained now none but the *Divine Nature* in Him, and that he was no more a *Man*, and used this Comparison, That is was in like Manner as in the *Sacrament*, where the *Bread* was Changed into the *Body* of *Christ*; (*b*) *Yes*, said *Theodoret*, *it is in the same Manner, that is, in no Manner at all*; for that the *Bread* though Changed in its Use and Significancy, yet lost not its *Nature*, but Remained truly and properly *Bread* as before, But had he believed *Transubstantiation*, this had been a full and absolute Confirmation of the *Eutychian* Heresy, instead of a Confutation; for then there had Remained no more of the *Humane Nature* in *Christ*, than you believe the *Substance* of the *Bread* to Remain in the *Sacrament*. This explains the Meaning of *Theodoret*, even beyond his Words, and he says in the same Place, *That our Blessed Saviour, Who called Himself the Living Bread and Wine, hath also honoured the Visible Signs with the Title and Appellation of His Body and Blood, not Changing their Nature, but adding to Nature, Grace.*

Pope.

(*a*) Μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας φύσεως, οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἴδους, καὶ ἐφαπτά ἐστι, καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. *Ibid.*

(*b*) See his Dialogue called *The Immoveable.*

Pope *Gelasius* says, (a) *That the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, which we take, is a Divine thing, by which we are made Partakers of the Divine Nature. And yet it ceases not to be the Substance and Nature of Bread and Wine: And certainly* (says he) *the Image and Similitude of the Body and Blood is Celebrated in the Mysteries.*

And *Facundus* says the same, (b) *Not* (says he) *that the Bread is properly His Body, or the Cup His Blood; but that they contain the Mystery of His Body and Blood.*

And St. *Augustin* says, (c) *If Sacraments did not bear some Similitude to the things of which they are the Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all: But from this Similitude, they often take the Name of the things themselves.— As*, says he, *the Sacrament of Faith, which is Baptism, is called Faith.*

And St. *Chrysostome* speaking of the Vessels in which the Sacrament was put, (d) *In which*, says he, *there is not the true Body of Christ, but the Mystery of His Body is Contained in them.*

But,

(a) *Et tamen non definit esse Substantia vel Natura Panis & Vini: Et certe Imago & Similitudo Corporis & Sanguinis Christi in Actione Mysteriorum celebrantur.* Gelas. contr. Nestorium & Eutychetem. (b) Non quod propriè Corpus Ejus sit Panis, & Poculum Sanguis; sed quod Mysterium Corporis Ejus, Sanguinisq; contineant. *Lib.* ix. *c.* v. (c) *Si Sacramenta*, &c. Ep. xxiii. And. contr. *Faust. Manich.* l. x. c. ii. *Sic Sacramentum Fidei quod Baptismus intelligitur, Fides est.* (d) *In quibus non est Verum Corpus Christi, sed Mysterium Corporis Ejus continetur.* See St. *Chrysost.* opere imperf. in *Matth.* and *Epist. ad Cesarium*, in *Biblioth. P.* Colon. 1618.

But, My Lord, not to trouble you with more Quotations, I refer you to Bishop *Cosin* his *History of Transubstantiation*, where beginning at the *Institution*, he sets down in every *Century*, the Words of the *Fathers* upon this Point. A little Book, long Printed both in *English* and *Latin*, not yet Answered (that I hear) and I believe Unanswerable, wherein you will see a Cloud of Witnesses, through the first Ages of the Church, and so downwards, in perfect Contradiction to this New Article of your *Faith*.

And as the *Scriptures*, primitive *Church* and *Fathers* are all against you, so have you nothing in the World on your Side, but an Unintelligible *Jargon* of *Metaphysicks*, upon which the *School-Men* ring Changes, till the Noise of their Bells have deafen'd Common *Sense* and *Reason*. Such are their Subtilties upon *Substance*, *Accidents*, *Subsistence*, *Modusses*, and *Modalities*, and many more such *Quiddities*; and their *Distinctions* of *Materialiter* and *Formaliter*, *per se* & *per Accidens*, and a Thousand more, to Solve all *Difficulties*, and Reconcile *Contradictions*! No Absurdity can be named out of the Reach of a *Distinction*. And when we Understand it not, it Operates most Effectually, because then we may suppose there is something in it! Pray, my Lord, let me ask you, Do you know the Difference betwixt *Substance* and *Accident*?

L. Substance is that which *Sub stat*, stands under or supports another thing, So the *Substance* stands by it self, and the *Accidents* do Adhere or Stick in it. Therefore we say, that *Essentia Accidentis est Inhœrentia*, that *Inherence* or *In-sticking* is the *Essence* or very *Being* of an *Accident*, so that there cannot be an *Accident* without it, for whatever *Sticks* must have something to *Stick* in.

G. When the *Substance* then is Gone, what becomes of the *Accidents* :

L. They are no more, for their *Essence* is Gone, which is *Inherence*, and they cannot *Inhere* or *Stick* in Nothing.

G. Now to Apply this, when the *Substance* of the *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Sacrament* is Gone, as you suppose, then their *Accidents* are no more, for there cannot be *Accidents* of *Nothing*, *Nothing* has no *Accidents*. And they cannot be the *Accidents* of *Bread* when there is no *Bread*. (*a*) And you will not Endure they should be called the *Accidents*, of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* : Therefore they are the *Accidents* of *Nothing*, that is, they are *Accidents* and *no Accidents* : They are *Accidents* without the *Essence* of *Accidents*, which is *Inherence* : There is *Roundness* and nothing *Round*, *Whiteness* and nothing *White*, a *Taste* and nothing *Tasted*, *Liquidness* and nothing *Liquid*, &c. And if these *Accidents* stand by themselves, why are they not *Substances* ?

(*a*) *Catechis. ad Paroch. de Eucharist. Sacram.* Sect. xxv. xliv.

ſtances? For that is the Definition you give of *Subſtance.* If you ſay they ſtand by *Miracle*, then by *Miracle* they are *Subſtances.* And there is an End of the *Jargon!* But who ſees not that *Roundneſs* without any thing *Round*, and the like which you call *Accidents*, are nothing at all in Nature, but Abſtracted *Notions* of our own Heads, *Creatures* of our making, which, like *Ens Rationis*, have no *Exiſtence* but in our *Brains.* Yet we Diſpute about theſe, as if they were Real things; which we come at laſt to *Fancy*, by their being Dinned ſo long in our Ears at the *Schools*: And we Fight for them, as *pro Aris & Focis*; we make them *Articles* of our *Faith*, and *Excommunicate* for them!

L. Notwithſtanding your Ridiculing *Philoſophy*, you will not ſay, that we can *See* the *Subſtance* of any thing. But that whatever comes under our outward *Senſes*, that is, whatever can be *Seen*, *Felt*, *Heard*, *Smelled*, or *Taſted*, are only the *Accidents* of things.

G. And the ſame *Philoſophy* will tell me that neither can *Accidents* be *Seen*, *Felt*, &c. For example, a *Round* or a *White* thing is a *Subſtance*, but the *Roundneſs* or the *Whiteneſs* are the *Accidents*; Now I cannot *See* or *Feel*, *Roundneſs* or *Whiteneſs*, they are only *Conceptions* in my *Mind*, and come not under any of my outward *Senſes*, they are too *Thin* to bear either my *Sight*, *Smell*, *Touch* or *Taſt.* Nay, I will ſay that they are beyond my *Imagination* too, for who can *Think* of *Roundneſs* or *Whiteneſs*, with-

out

out some *Thing* that is *Round* or *White*? Therefore if I *See* or *Feel* any *Thing*, it is the *Substance* I *See* or *Feel*, that is, some *Thing* which is *Round* or *White*. What *Colour*, *Taste* or *Smell*, has *Insticking* or *Inherence*? For that is *Accident*. Is it more like *Bread* than a *Tulip*? Thus easily may we Dispute our selves not only out of our *Senses*, but out of our *Thoughts* too: And the *Miracle* of *Accidents* without *Substance*, must not only work upon our *Senses*, but give us New *Thoughts*, new *Conceptions*, which never before came into the *Head* of Mortal Man! This is that *Philosophy* and *Vain Deceit* or *Fallacy* which the *Apostle* says (*a*) will *Spoil* or Hurt our *Faith*. Doting *about Questions and Strifes of Words—Perverse Disputings——and Oppositions of Science falsly so called: which some Professing, have Erred concerning the Faith.*

But if you are in Earnest about this *Logick* of *Substance* and *Accident*, will you lay a good *Wager* upon it?

L. Hudibras says, *Fools for Arguments lay Wagers.*

G. Yet you have laid all your *Honour* and *Estate* upon it——But are you so sure of it that you would take your *Oath* upon it?

L. These are Foolish Questions, and were never Asked in any School Dispute.

G. Nor ought to be, if you had let them stay there. But when you will bring them out of your *Schools* into your *Creed*, and make them Articles of *Faith*, you do as good as take your

(*a*) Cor. ii. 8. 1 Tim. vi. 4. 5, 20, 21.

your *Oath* upon the Truth and Certainty of them; and you Guard them with *Anathema's*. And it is Impossible you can believe *Trans-substantiation*, or know any thing of it, unless you be perfectly Skilled in the Nature and Difference of *Substance* and *Accident*, and how far their Powers do Reach. You must Distinguish between *Sub-stantiation*, *Con-substantiation*, and *Trans-substantiation*, and Determine whether the Nature of *Accidents* will best Agree with *Sub*, *Con*, or *Trans*.

L. I trouble not my Head with any of these things, but I believe as the *Church* believes, and there is an End of it.

G. Can you believe as the *Church* believes, without knowing what She believes? This is believing Nothing, It is *Implicit* indeed! At this Rate you need but one Article of your *Creed*, to believe the *Holy Catholick Church*. And all the Rest may go off *Implicitly*, though you should know nothing of any other of the *Articles*. And what a Man knows nothing of, he can give no *Reason* for. But St. *Peter* bids us (*a*) *be Ready always to give an Answer to every Man that asketh us a Reason of the Hope* (or Faith) *that is in us*. Which Supposes our Understanding it our selves, and not an *Implicit* Faith in others, of we know not what.

So that if you make *Trans-substantiation* an *Article*

(*a*) 1 Pet. iii. 15.

Article of your *Faith*, you are obliged to Understand it aright.

But there is something yet more Terrible behind, for if there be no *Trans-substantiation*, then you Worship *Bread* and *Wine* with *Latria*, by which you mean the *Supreme Worship* due to *God* alone.

Nay tho' *Trans-substantiation* were Granted, and fully Understood, yet it is Impossible for any Man to know whether he *Worships* plain *Bread* and *Wine*, or the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*? Because in the *Rubrick* of the *Mass*, *de Defectibus circa Missam*, there are several Cases put wherein the *Consecration* is void, and ther is no *Sacrament* made, and then ther is Nothing there but plain *Bread* and *Wine*. One of these Cases is, if ther be a greater Mixture of any other *Grain* than of *Wheat* in the *Wafer*, Another is, if the *Wine* be made of *Sour Grapes*, or *Grapes* not *Ripe*, *Si Vinum sit ex Uvis acerbis*, *vel non Maturis*, which is pretty hard to know for the People, who never Tast it, or the *Worshippers* who See or Tast neither but only a *Pixis* or a *Cup* they look not into: And in both these Cases (besides others) it is said, *Non conficitur Sacramentum*, ther is no *Sacrament* made. And so it is said if the *Intention* of the *Priest* be wanting, which is Impossible to know: Upon which Head they put a pleasant Case, as Suppose a Priest *Intends* to Consecrate *Ten* Wafers (for Example) and after Consecration ther be found *Eleven* or more, then None of them are Consecrated, because the *Intention* going only to

Ten, it cannot be known which these *Ten* are. But if there be *Nine* or fewer, they are all consecrated, because the *Intention* going to *Ten*, it Includes all within that Number. Besides you must take it wholly upon Trust, whether there be any *Consecration* at all; because your *Priests* do not *Consecrat* before the *People* when they Administer the *Sacrament*, but at Set times they *Consecrat* Numbers of *Wafers* together, which they Reserve for Occasions, and for daily *Worship*. Again it is said in some Cases, *Dubium est an conficiatur Sacramentum*, that it is *Doubtful* whether the *Sacrament* is made or not. And what shall we do in this Case? Is it a *Doubt* whether we Worship *God* or a *Creature*? Or is it *Indifferent* to which we give *Latria*?

L. If there should be a Mistake in any of these Matters, and we Worship meer *Creatures*, not knowing it, for which we have been Charged with *Idolatry*, we have an Answer ready, That this could amount to no more than *Material* Idolatry, but it could not be *Formally* so, while our *Intention* was Right, and we Meant our Worship to *God*.

G. These *School-Distinctions* are *Cobwebs*, and will bear no Weight, for *Material* Idolatry is *Idolatry*, else it were not *Material Idolatry*. And if our *Intention* will solve it, it will solve it also as to the *Heathen*, who Directed their *Worship* and Referred it Ultimately to the true *God*, as has been shewn. But I hope you will not make *Solomon* so stupid as you have made the

Heathen

Heathen, and to think that he believed (u) *Asteroth* the Goddess of the *Zidonians*, and *Miloom* the Abomination of the *Ammonites* and the other *Gods* of the Nations whom he Worshipped, to be every one of them the one only *Supreme God*! Yet he is Charged with *Idolatry*, whether *Material* or *Formal* is not the Question, nor is there a Word of it in the *Scriptures*, for *Idolatry* is *Idolatry*, let it be of what sort it will. And these *Distinctions* are only to Excuse it, and let it loose among us. *God* has forbidden it Generally, of every Kind and Sort. The *Arians* were Charged with *Idolatry* for worshipping *Christ*, supposing Him but a *Creature*. And they were so far from Disowning the True *God*, that it was His Honour they pretended in denying *Divinity* to *Christ*. So of the *Socinians*, and our *Unitarians* among us, who give themselves that Name for their Supporting the *Unity* of the *Godhead*. Yet they are Charged with *Idolatry* for Worshipping *Christ* as an *Inferior God*. And they have the same Distinction as you of *Latria* and *Dulia*, a higher and lower Degree of Worship. But all *Religious* Worship is forbiddon to any but to *God* alone. These *Degrees* of it are of Humane Invention, to Excuse our Breach of the Commands of God. But we are to keep far from the Forbidden thing, not Try how Near we can come to it, by *Distinctions* of our own Coyning. We ought to *make a Hedge about the Law*, as the

(u) 1. Kin. xi. 5.

Phrase of the *Jews* was, to Guard against any Approaches towards the Breach of it. Or in the Apostle's Words, to (*a*) *Abstain from all Appearance of Evil.* And remember that we venture our *Souls* upon these *Distinctions.* Which then are in the Safest Way, we who follow the Direct *Rule* of *God's Commandments* as they are plainly laid down to us in Holy *Scripture*; without (*b*) *Turning to the Right Hand or to the Left, without either Adding to them, or Diminishing from them*, as we are Commanded: Or you who *Distinguish* the plainest *Precepts*, and make them speak *Metaphysicks?*

By which the Worship of the *Devil* may be Justified, for it is Plain that when he offer'd to our *Saviour* all the *Kingdoms* of the *World*, he meant not that he was the *Supreme God* and *Sovereign Disposer* of them, but only as having Received this Power from the *Sovereign Disposer*, for he said, (*c*) *That is Delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will, I give it.* And it is as Plain by the Answer our *Saviour* gave him, *Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.* That all sort of *Religious Worship* was forbidden to be given to Any but to God only. And S. *Augustine* makes all to be *Devils* who *Require* or *Accept* it: *Latria* and *Dulia* signifie both the same thing, that is *Service*; and here all *Religious Service* is Reserved to *God* only. The *Distinction* of the *Schools* is *vain*, and meant only to Elude the Commands of *God*, and Introduce all *Superstition.* Ther

(*a*) 1 Thess. v. 12. (*b*) Deut. iv. 2. v. 32. (*c*) Luk. iv. 6. 8.

Ther are other unworthy Cases put in the *Rubrick* of the *Mass*, which flow from hence, as if a *Dog* or a *Mouse* should eat the *Sacrament* —— If the *Priest* should *Vomit* it up again, in which Case, he is to *Lick* it up *Reverently*, unless it be *Nauseous*, (that was well put in) and then it is to be Disposed of so and so. And again, if a *Fly* should Drop into the *Cup*, how the *Fly* was to be Dealt with —— And one Reason given for taking the *Cup* from the *Laity* was, That the *Laity* (at that time I suppose) wore Long Beards, and lest the *Blood* of *Christ* should Drop upon them, or Stick to their Whiskers! All these are the genuine Effects of *Superstition*, occasioned by the Notion of *Trans-substantiation*.

And here, My Lord, let me observe, That the Natural Effect of *Superstition* is *Atheism* or *Deism*. As one Extreme runs into another, like *East* to *West*. For Men of Sense must find out the Deceit that is in *Superstition*, and then placing all *Religion* on the same foot (as in your Communion upon the Authority of your *Church*) they must think the whole to be a *Deceit*, or in the Modish Word, *Priest-Craft*, and the Contrivance of those who Gain by it. Whence it is, that the *Holy Scriptures* and the *Legends* have the same Foundation in the Church of *Rome*, that is, her *Authority*; therefore the Common People believe them both alike, and the Men of Sense believe neither. And this does so lead towards the General *Defection* foretold, that in a great Mea-

sure it is it; for it destroys the Foundation of *Religion*, and turns it all to *Superstition*. And when the *Infidelity* which that begets shall come to be Publickly owned, then where shall *Faith* be found upon the Earth? It is now *acted* in the *Opus Operatum*. And instead of the *Two Sacraments* which *Christ* has Appointed as a *Means* of *Grace*, the whole *Face* of your *Religion* is covered with ten Thousand of your own Invention. The Unlimited Power taken in your *Church* of *Consecrating* every thing into a *Means* of *Grace*, your Worship of *Saints* (many of them *Legendary*) their *Reliques* and *Images*, of *Crosses*, and of the *Host*, make up the Bulk of your *Religion* and *Devotions*.

(§8.) But not only the *Host*, or *Body* of *Christ* supposed to be *Corporally* in the *Sacrament*, but the *Cross* of *Christ*, or any *Effigies* of that *Cross*; and the *Images* of *Christ*, are Worshipped in your Church with the Supreme Divine Adoration of *Latria*. As is told us by a Great *St.* of your *Church*, whom you call the *Angelical Doctor*, St. *Thomas Aquinus*, who says that *(a) Crux Christi est Adoranda Adoratione Latriæ*. And again, *Crucis Effigies in aliqua alia Materia——— Latria adoranda est*. And in the *Roman Pontifical* it is ordered, that in the Procession of the *Emperor* and a *Legate* of the *Pope*, the Legate's *Cross* shall be carried on the

(a) Par. 3 Qu. 3 Art. 4. in Cor. Conclusio.

the Right Hand of the Emperor's *Sword*, because (*a*) *Latria* is due to the *Cross*.

And in the Adoration of the *Cross* upon *Good-Friday* (which is the Principal Part of the Office for that Day) the *Cross* being Velled, is Discovered to the People by Degrees, first one *Arm* of the *Cross*, then another, and at last the whole *Cross* is Unveiled: And at each time the Priest says, *Ecce lignum Crucis, Behold the Wood of the Cross*: And the People answer, *Adoremus, Let us Worship*: And then the *Priests* first, and afterwards the *People*, come upon their Knees and pay their *Adoration* to the *Cross*. And remember that it is the Adoration of *Latria* which they give to it.

Now for *Images*, the same *Aquinus* before Mentioned tells us the Worship we pay them is (*b*) *Religionis Cultus*, a *Religious Worship*; and that it is not a different *Latria* which is given to *Christ* and to His *Images*, but says, (*c*) *That when Worship is paid to the Images of Christ, the Reason of the Latria is not Different, nor the Vertue of Religion.*

If then ther be but one *Latria*, and the same that is paid to *Christ* and to His *Images*, it will Justify what *James Naclantus*, Bishop of *Clugium* Writes in his Exposition of the

(*a*) *Quia debetur ei* (Cruci) *Latria*. (*b*) 2da 2dæ. Quæ 81. Art. 3. Resp. ad 3. (*c*) Quod Imaginibus Christi exhibetur Cultus, non diversificatur ratio Latriæ, nec Virtus Religionis.

Epistle to the *Romans*, chap. 1. (*a*) That the Faithful ought not only to Worship *before an Image* (as some perhaps out of Caution speak) but to Worship the *Image* it self, without any Scruple at all; and with the same Sort of Worship as the *Proto-type* or whom it Represents; and if that is to be Worshipped with *Latria*, so its *Image* with *Latria*, if with *Dulia*, or *Hyperdulia*, so the *Image* is to be Worshipped with the same Worship.

39. Ther is another strange *Latria* paid to the *Præputium* of *Christ*, or the *Foreskin* was cut off at His *Circumcision*. Your Doctors are at great Pains to know what is become of it. They might as well ask what is become of the *Parings* of His *Nails!* Whither will *Superstition* run? They had it at *Antwerp*, but the Hereticks took it away. From thence it travelled by many Miracles to the Church of Saint *John Lateran* at *Rome*, and how it was thence Translated to the Church of *Cornelius* and *Cyprian* at *Calcata*, about Twenty Miles from *Rome*, I have read the Account at large in a Book in *Folio*, Intitled, *De Basilica & Pariarchio Lateranensi, ad Alexand.*

(*a*) *Ergo non solum fatendum est, fideles in Ecclesia adorare coram Imagine* (*ut Nonnulli ad Cautelam forte loquuntur*) *sed & Adorare Imaginem, sine quo volueris scrupulo, quin & eo illam Venereantur Cultu, quo & Prototypon ejus; propter quod si Illud habet adorari Latria, & Illa Latria, si Dulia, vel Hyperdulia, & Illa pariter ejusmodi Cultu adoranda est.* Venetiis.

lexand. VII. Pont. Max. auctore Cæsare Raspone ejusdem Basilicæ, Canonico. Romæ, 1656. p. 364, &c. And of the *Miraculous* Difference it shewed when it was touched by *Virgins* and by *Marryed Women!* See the *Devotions of the Roman Church*, p. 31. Where you will find other Authors Quoted, as *Bollandus, Act. Sanct. ad Jan.* 1. *de Præputio Christi*, and *Rivet. Apologia pro S. Maria Virgine: Lib.* 1. *c.* xvii. Cardinal *Tolet, in cap.* ii. *Luc. Annot.* 31. and *Salmeron, in Evang. Tom.* 3. *Tract.* 36. And that though it is still at *Calcata*, yet it is carry'd about at *Podium* with great Veneration upon the Feast of the *Ascension*. *Salmeron* in the place above Quoted tells out of the *Legend* of *Jacobus de Voragine*, that the Blessed *Virgin* gave this *Præpucium* first to *Mary Magdalen*, and that it was brought afterwards by an *Angel* to *Charles* the *Great* at *Aken*, and how after it came to be laid up in the *Lateran:* Whence these Verses,

Circumcisa Caro Christi, Sandalia Sacra,
Atque Umbilici viget hic Præcisio chara.

Put thus into English.

Christ's foreskin and blest Sandals are kept here,
And what was cut from off his Navel dear.

I suppose they meant the Cutting of His *Navel String*. And His *Sandals* (though it is not said that He wore any, He is always Painted *bare-foot*) will come in here too for

Latria

Latria, for the same Reason which *T. Aquinas* gives for *Latria* as due to the *Cross*, (a) *propter Membrorum Christi contactum*, because it *Touched* the *Body* of *Christ*. Then all his *Clothes* must come in for the same Reason, and the *Nails* and *Spear* that pierced Him. And why not the *Spittle* that was thrown in His Face? For the *Cross* was as much his *Enemy* (as far as *Wood* could be) as any of the other, or the *Spittle* it self. And I know not why the *Crucifiers* should not be Admitted too; though they touched Him with a Hostile Mind, as some have Sainted *Judas*, because he was an Instrument in our Redemption. For ther is no Stop in *Superstition* more than in other *Arts*.

But I must not forget my Friends the *School-Men* upon this Occasion, they Dispute, that the *Foreskin* being of the Intireness of the *Body*, it must have been Reunited to the *Body* of *Christ* upon His *Resurrection*, else that the Intire *Body* did not Arise. (b) *Suarez* therefore Concludes, that the *Body* of *Christ* at the *Resurrection* had a *Foreskin*, and has now in *Heaven*. But what then will he do with that *Foreskin*, which is shewed in the *Church* here below? He says, that the *Foreskin* belongs to the Intireness of the *Body*, *non Formaliter*, *sed Materialiter*, not *Formally*, but only *Materially*, and so the business is made up! But he adds, that *Innocent*

(a) Par. 3. Qu. 2. Art. 4 in the *Conclusion*. (b) Suar. in 3. Par. Qu. 54. Act. 4. Disp. 47. §. 1.

Innocent iii. did call in Question the Truth of this *Foreskin* upon Earth. Is it a Question then? And do the People still pay *Latria* to it? How comes this to be Suffered in the *Church*? In the *Church* that is *Infallible*!

But several Parcels of the *Blood* of *Christ* Shed upon the *Cross* are likewise shewed, and (*a*) *Cressy* quotes *Matth. Paris* for a Signal Testimony of it.

To this says (*b*) *Aquinas*, that *whatever belongs to the Nature of an Humane Body was wholly in the Body of Christ when He arose, as His Flesh and Bones, and His Blood, and that intirely without any Diminution, otherwise* (says he) *it had not been a perfect Resurrection*. And afterwards, (*c*) *that all the Blood* which flowed from the *Body* of *Christ*, Rose again in His Body. *But as for that Blood* (says he) *which is preserved in some Churches for Reliques, it did not flow from Christ's Side, but is said to have flowed Miraculously from a certain Image of Christ that was pierced.* Yet the People pay *Latria* to it, Grounded wholly upon a *Legend*! And *Aquinas* gives no further Assurance of it, than *that it was said*. Is not this Worshipping in *Faith*! What *Blood* was that which came out of the *Image*? Was it *Christ*'s Blood? And how was it made so? Was it *Trans-substantiated*, or was it *Blood Materially*, though not *Formally*? Or had it only the *Colour* of *Blood*, the *Accidents* remaining without the *Substance*? *Vasquez* comes pretty

(*a*) *Ch. Hist.* l. 2. c. 13. (*b*) Part. 3. Qu. 34. Artic. 2. *Respondet dicendum.* (*c*) *Ibid. ad Tertium.*

pretty near this when he says, (*b*) *That no Portion of the Blood of Christ did remain on Earth under the Form of Blood, but only under its Colour*, amissa Forma Sanguinis, *having lost the Form of Blood.*

L. What is this *Matter* and *Form* with which they keep such a Stir?

G. They make *three* Constituting *Principles* in every thing, these they call *Materia, Forma, et Privatio.* That is, the *Matter* of which any thing is made; the *Form*, which is wholly unknown to us; and the *Want* of that *Form*, for you must know that we must *Want* a thing, before we *Have* it!

L. Trouble me no more with this *Jargon*. I pin not my Faith upon *Schoolmen*.

G. Yet this Article of your *Faith*, that is, *Trans-substantiation*, it nothing else, as I have (I hope) made it plain. And I will shew you another Instance wherein you follow them too, and are grosly Misled by them, that is, the Distinction of *Concomitancy*.

L. What is that? I know it not.

(40.) *G.* I have before told of Several Injuries done to our Lord *Christ*, in *Adding* to His Commandments, and making to ourselves *Means* of *Grace* which he has not Instituted. What I am to speak of now is an Error on the other hand, that is of *Substracting* from

(*b*) In 3 par. Thomæ. Qu. 5. Artic. 2. Disp. 36. c. 8. See also c. 4.

from his *Institutions*, and the *Means* of *Grace* which He has Appointed. I mean in taking away the *Cup* from the *Laity* in the Holy *Sacrament*, *Christ* Instituted the *Sacrament* of His *Body* and *Blood* as an Effectual *Means* of *Grace*, calling it the *Communion of His Body and Blood*. Particularly of the *Cup* it is said, (*a*) *The Cup of Blessing which we Bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ?* And that we all Partake of the *Cup*, according to several Manuscripts of your own *Vulgar Latin*, *Omnes de uno Pane, et de uno Calice participamus*. But that the *Laity* might not think themselves Deprived of this so Beneficial a *Means* of the Greatest *Grace*, the *Schools* have Invented a *Distinction* they call *Concomitancy*, which is, That in all *Flesh* there is some *Blood* goes along, or is *Concomitant* with it, so that whoever Eat the *Flesh* partake also of the *Blood*.

L. And is not that True?

G. Really, My Lord, I know not. But I am sure it is a *Nicety*. For *Flesh* may be so dryed that no *Blood* shall appear in it, and in a *Wafer* there can be None, without having Recourse to *Miracle*. I think it is making too Bold, to throw off the Institution of *Christ*, upon such Imaginations of our own; which Imply that there was no need of the Institution of the *Cup*, for if it be not Necessary

(*a*) 1 Cor. x. 16. 17.

ſary now, it was not ſo Then. But, my Lord, this *Sacrament* was Ordained, not only to Expreſs the *Death* of *Chriſt*, but alſo the *Manner* of it, that is, by the Shedding of His *Blood*, according to the *Bloody Types* of Him under the *Law*, as it is ſaid, (a) *without ſhedding of Blood there is no Remiſſion. It was therefore Neceſſary*, ſays the Apoſtle. But whatever *Blood* may be *Concomitant* in the *Fleſh*, yet here is no *ſhedding* of it Expreſſed in the *Wafer*.

L. But the *Cup* always goes along with the *Bread* in our Church, to Compleat the *Sacrifice*, though the *Prieſt* only who Officiates partakes of the *Cup*.

But when the *Hoſtia* is carry'd in Proceſſion, as upon *Corpus Chriſti* Day, or frequently to the Sick, there is no *Cup*, nor does the *Prieſt* himſelf *Communicate*. But however, if the People are to Partake of the *Sacrifice*, as it was under the Law, here they are Defrauded of Half of it! And they are as much Commanded to Partake of the *Cup* as of the *Bread*. And the Church may as well take away the *Bread*, and leave only the *Cup*, and ſay, that the *Fleſh* is Contained in the *Blood*, as well as the *Blood* in the *Fleſh*. Stange Power of *Church*! What *Inſtitution* of *God* can ſtand at this Rate? Suppoſe the *Jews* had neglected to pour out or Sprinkle

(a) Heb. ix. 22.

Sprinkle the *Blood* of their *Sacrifices* as Commanded, and said it was Sufficient that it was by *Concomitancy* in the *Flesh*, would this *Distinction* have served in that Case? And why not as well as in This?

It is observable that *Christ*, as foreseeing this taking away of the *Cup* from Many, added the Word *All* to the Drinking of the *Cup*, (a) *Drink ye All of it.* And it is said, *they All Drank of it*, It is not said so of the *Bread.*

L. There were None there but the *Apostles.* So that this Refers not to the *Laity.*

G. So you may say of the *Bread*, and Take That too from the *Laity* by the same Rule, and you take the *Cup* from the *Priests* who do not Officiate. But *Christ* said to the *People* to the *Laity*, (b) *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink His Blood, ye have no Life in you.* And this is Understood by all you of the *Church* of *Rome* as spoken of the *Sacrament.*

L. (c) *Bellarmin* says, That the *And* there *And drink*, is to be Uuderstood as an *Or*, that is, Except ye either Eat *or Drink.*

G. That is to say, I may Uuderstand all the *Ands* in the *Creed* to be *Ors*, and instead of I believe this, *And* this, *And* this, I may say, I believe this, *Or* this, *Or* this, so that if

I

(a) Matth. xxvi. 27. Mark xiv. 23. (b) Joh. vi. 53. (c) De Sacram. Eucharist. *l.* 4. c. 25.

I believe any *One Article*, it is Sufficient, though I believe never another. If you send your Servant to Market, and bid him bring *Beef* and *Mutton* and *Pork*, and he buys only *Beef*, and says, he Understood all your *Ands* for *Ors*. And so if you bid him bring so much *Meat* and so much *Drink*, and he brings only the *Meat*, for the same Reason —— Thus we may easily get over all the Commands of God, and give the Reverse to (*a*) Saint *James*, that *he who offends in one Point is Guilty of all.* No, but *he who keeps one Point, keeps the whole Law.* This is *Bantering* instead of *Arguing*. And it shews a Cause to be very Destitute, when so Great a Man as *Bellarmin* could Content himself with giving such an Answer.

And the Doctrine of *Concomitancy* will not do here, for if I eat a piece of *Flesh*, suppose some *Blood* may be said to be *Concomitant* there; yet I cannot be said to *Drink*, where there is not one *Drop*. And the Threatning is, Except ye *Drink*, there is no Life in you.

(*b*) *If it be but a Man's Testament* (saith St. *Paul*) *yet if it be Confirmed, no Man Disannulleth, or Addeth thereto.* This Holy *Sacrament* was the last *Testament* which *Christ* left to His *Church*, instituted the Evening before He entered upon His Sacred *Passion*. Therefore Pope *Gelasius* had good Reason to call it

(*a*) Jam. ii. 10. (*b*) Gal. iii. 15.

it [a] *Sacrilege* in any who should Mutilate this *Sacrament*, and Commanded that they who would not *Drink* of the *Cup*, should be Denyed the Bread too.

L. This was only to Discover the *Manichians*, who would not Drink of the *Cup*, for other Reasons than the Church of *Rome* had to take it from the *Laity*.

G. I never heard a tolerable Reason for it except because they were *Laity!* But the Dispute is not about the *Reasons* for it, but the Thing it self. To take away the *Cup* is to Mutilate the *Sacrament*: And that is *Sacrilege* by *Gelasius* his Determination.

And this last *Testament* of our *Lord*, which was *Confirmed* by the *Practice* of the *Church* for *Fourteen Hundred* Years was Mutilated by the [b] Council of *Constans*, and the *Cup* taken from the *Laity*, with a *Non-Obstante* as well to the *Institution* of *Christ*, as the *Practice* of the *Primitive Church*? It was Declared no *Sacrilege*; and the *Priest* was Excommunicated who should Communicate the *Laity* under *Both Kinds*.

The Council of *Trent* [c] likewise puts in its *Caveat* to the *Institution* in *Both Kinds*, and

M that

[a] apud *Gratian.* can. *Comperimus* de *Consecr.* Dist. 2. — [b] licet Christus — administraverit Sub utraque Specie Panis et vini — tamen hoc non Obstante — Et Similiter quod licet in primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi Sacramentum recipiretur a fidelibus Sub utraque Specie; tamen — precipimus Sub pœna Excommunicationis quod nullus Presbyter communicet Populum Sub utraque Specie Panis et vini. Sess. 13 [c] Sess. 21. Can. 1, 2, 3.

that notwithstanding the *Laity* must be Excluded from the *Cup*. And they make it a *Heresie* to say, that *Whole Christ* is not under *Each Species*. Then the *Flesh* is as much in the *Blood*, as the *Blood* in the *Flesh*. And it is all one which *Species* we take. But since the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* were *Separated* at his *Death*, and He ordained them to be so *Separated* in the *Sacrament* of it, I see not how We can take away Either *Part*, upon the Account of their not being *Separated*.

L. Our *Catechism ad Parachos* gives *Six* Reasons for taking away the *Cup*, (*a*) *First*, The Danger of *Spilling* it. *Secondly*, Of its turning *Sour*. *Thirdly*, and *Fourthly*, For our *Health*, because some could not bear the Taste or Smell of *Wine*, without being Sick. *Fifthly*, That *Wine* was very Dear in some Places, And the *Sixth*, That we might believe *Whole Christ* to be under *each Species*. *Gerson*'s Reason about the Long *Beards* of the *Laity*, before Mentioned, comes under the first of these Heads concerning *Spilling*.

G. Now, My Lord, I leave it to your self, Whether these Reasons be not very Childish, or are of Weight to Maim the *Institution* of *Christ*?

Ther must no Comparison be made betwixt the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, as to Preference, or which is most valuable: But our *Redemption*

(*a*) De Eucharist. Sacrament. Sect. lxx.

tion is oftner Attributed in Holy Scripture to His *Blood* than to His *Body*. *We are Saved by His* BLOOD— *Propitiation through His* BLOOD — *by the Sprinkling of His* BLOOD— &c.

L. Ther is Mention made sometimes of the breaking of *Bread*, when ther is nothing said of the *Cup*; and this we make use of as an Argument that the *Cup* is not Necessary. This is mainly Insisted upon in our *Catechism*, the *Chap.* you just now Named; *Sect*, lxix, And *Joh.* vi. 51. is Quoted, *I am the Living Bread* —— *if any Man eat of this Bread* —— *And the Bread I will give is my Flesh.*

G. We take not this to be spoke of the *Sacrament*, but of *Faith* in *Christ*, here Expressed by *Eating*, that is, *Spiritually*, as Himself explains it, *ver.* 63. *It is the Spirit that Quickneth, the Flesh profiteth Nothing: The Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.* But let it be taken of the *Sacrament*, as you do, you will find the *Blood* Joined with the *Flesh*, in the next Words, ver. 53. *Except ye Eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink His Blood*—— as before Quoted: And again, *ver.* 54. *Whoso Eateth My Flesh, and Drinketh My Blood*—— And *ver.* 55. *For My Flesh is Meat indeed, and My Blood is Drink indeed.* And *ver.* 56. *He that Eateth My Flesh, and Drinketh My Blood* —— Is not the *Blood* here Named with the *Flesh*? But if it were not, ther are a Hundred Places, as I now observed, where the *Blood* of *Christ* is Named as *Cleansing*, as *Redeeming* us, *&c.* without

any Mention of His *Flesh* or *Body*. Are they therefore Excluded? This is such a sort of Reasoning, as if I invite you to *Eat* with me, you must have no *Drink* to your Dinner, because it was not Named. But if by *Eating* we commonly mean the Whole *Meal*, and *Drinking* is likewise Included, this *Criticism* upon the *Lord's Supper*, of calling it *Eating*, will Appear what it is, and not be thought Sufficient to Exclude the *Cup* in the *Sacrament*. And other Foundation you have none in *Scripture*. But if I once call it *Eating* the *Lord's Supper*, and several times call it both *Eating* and *Drinking*, will not the Latter explain the Former? Or will *Eating* exclude *Drinking*, though *Drinking* be expresly Named? To *Eat* the *Lord's Supper* is the only Phrase we use, I never heard any Body call it *Drinking* the *Supper*: And you may thence Prove, that we have not the *Cup* in our *Sacrament*, as well as that the *Apostles* had it not, because it is said they *Eat Bread*, or broke *Bread*. But I have Over-Laboured this Point, because you lay so much Stress upon it.

I will now shew you another Restriction your *Church* has made upon the *Institutions* of *God*. As she has taken the *Cup* from the *Laity*, so has she taken another of your *Sacraments*, that is *Marriage* from the *Clergy*. I pass by the *Politick* Views and Advantages the Court of *Rome* has in this, as giving the *Pope* the more Absolute Command and making

king Him in Effect *Heir* of all the great Possessions of the *Clergy*, for the *Canon Law* obliges the Regular Bishops not to Dispose of their Estates by [a] *Will*, and the other *Clergy* not to be too Liberal of their *Alms* in their Sickness. And what they leave, the *Pope* dispóses of as Grand *Treasurer* of the *Church*. But waving all this, I will Insist now only upon what Relates to *Conscience*. You reckon it a *Defilement* in your *Church* for a *Clergy-Man* to *Marry*. No great Complement to the Marryed State, which yet was *Instituted* of *God* in *Paradise* while Man was in his *Innocence*. And the Apostle says, [b] *Marriage is Honourable in All, and the Bed Undefiled*. And *forbidding to Marry* is Reckoned one of the [c] *Doctrines of Devils*. And directions are given how a *Bishop* should Govern his *Wife* and *Children*, [d] *for if a Man know not how to Rule his own House, how shall he take Care of the Church of God?* Yet your Interpreters would have this *Wife* and this *House* to be the *Church*! St. *Peter* was a *Married* Man, and forsook not his Wife after he was an *Apostle*, but [e] *led her about* with him *as other Apostles* did And that in the Primitive Church the *Clergy* did *Marry* is Plain from *Socrates* his *Eccles. Hist.* lib. i. cap. 11 and l. v. c. 22. The Vow of *Single Life* was not Imposed upon the *Clergy* till *Pope Hildibrand*. See

[a] *Decretal.* Gregor. *lib.* 3 *de Testam. tit.* 26. *cap.* 7. 9. [b] Heb. xiii. 4. [c] 1. Tim. iv. 3. [d] Chap. iii. 5. [e] 1. *Cor.* ix. 5.

Matth. Westmon. ad An. 1074, *Vincent.* Spec. Hist. l. 24. c. 45. *Antonin.* l. 16. c. 1. §. 21. And it was *without Precedent* (says *Sigebert*, Chron. ad An. 1074.) *and, as many thought, out of an indiscreet Zeal, contrary to the Opinion of the Holy Fathers.* But *Hildebrand*, was not obeyed in this in *England* for above a Hundred Years after, for our ancient Records say, (*a*) *All those Decrees availed nothing, for the Priests by the King's Consent still had their Wives as formerly.* And *Gregory* the Great said (*b*) *That it was lawful for such of the Clergy as could not contain, to Marry.* And *Pius* the *Second* said the same; (*c*) *That they may be allowed to Marry.* And your great Canonist *Panormittan* says; (*d*) *Ther is as great Reason to allow Priests to Marry now, as ever ther was to Restrain it.* Let St. *Bernard* bear Witness in his Time what Reason ther was for Allowing it, he says, (*e*) *Ther are many who cannot be hid for their Multitude, nor do seek to be Concealed through their Impudence, who, being Restrained from the Nuptial Remedies, run into all Filthiness.* And another says, (*f*) *That few in those Days were free from Fornication.* And *Matthew Paris* tells that the *Pope* thought it almost a Miracle that a *Candedate* for a

(*a*) Histor. *Petroburg.* An. 1127. ap. *Spelm.* T. 2. p. 36. (*b*) Respons. ad Interrog. Secund. *Aug. Cantuar.* (*c*) *Pius* 2. in Gest. Concil. *Basil.* See also *Platin.* in his Life. p. 329. (*d*) De Clericis conjug. can. *cum olim.* (*e*) De Convers. ad Cleric. cap. 29. (*f*) Gloss. ad *Gratian.* Dist. 82. c. 5.

a Bishoprick was said to be a *Pure Virgin*. Whence the *Gloss. ad Gratian* in the Place just before Quoted, calls (*a*) *Fornication* but a *Venial* Sin. And it is Tollerated if not Allowed (*b*) However it was Reckoned a less Sin in a *Priest* than *Marriage*. For this Reason, *Deadly Sin* is added to *Fornication* in our *Litany*. But why was *Celibacy* enjoined to the *Priests*? And why *Marriage* a greater Sin than *Fornication*? Because the First is a Breach of the Command of the *Church*, and the Latter of the Command of *God*! And the Difference of the *Punishment* of these in your *Church*, shews that she thinks so; for a *Priest* committing *Fornication* comes off for a Small *Penance*, whereas if he *Marries* he is *Degraded*. May we not then say to the *Church* of *Rome*, as *Christ* to the *Church* of the *Jews*, in a Parallel Case, (*c*) *Full well ye Reject the Commandment of God, that ye may keep your own Tradition.*

But if *Marriage* be such a *Defilement* as is Unworthy a *Priest*, how came you to make a *Sacrament* of it? I suppose you cannot mean less by a *Sacrament* than a *Means* of *Grace*, you have made many less things so, as is shewed before. And would you Deprive the *Clergy* of any *Means* of *Grace*? Or is it your Modesty to put them upon the Level with the *Laity* for Depriving them of the *Cup* in the *Sacrament* of *Christ*'s own *Institution*.

(*a*) *Decret.* P. *Alex.* l. 3. tit. 2. c. 3. *Gloss.* ad *Gratian.* dist. 82. c. 5
(*b*) Ibid. *Dist.* 34, *Can.* 7. *Costerus* Enchirid. de Cœlibat. c. 17.
(*c*) Mark. vii. 9.

Marriage is *Honourable* and *Undefiled* in *All*, says the *Apostle*. *No*, say you, *it is neither in a Priest*. He says. [a] *If Men cannot contain, let them Marry; for it is better to Marry than to Burn*, No, say you, it is better to *Burn* than to *Marry*. And this you must say, Unless you suppose that All the Many Thousands of your *Clergy*, and Many of them Young Men, are Every one of them Endowed with the Gift of *Continency*. Which would be a *Miracle*, if Experience did not Contradict it.

All Sober *Christians*, and even the *Heathen*, look upon Marriage as a Preserver and not a Breach of *Chastity*. St. *Peter* calls it a [b] *Chaste Conversation*. If it were not so, we may presume that *Christ* would not have Honoured it with His own *Presence*, and with His first *Miracle*, nor made it so frequently as He does, the *Type* and *Representation* of *Heaven*, and of His *Union* with the *Church*, calling Himself the *Bridegroom* and her His *Spouse*.

The Apostle says. [c] *To avoid Fornication, let every Man have his own Wife, and every Woman her own Husband*. No, say you, We Except all the *Clergy*, the *Friers* and the *Nuns*, whom we have put under *Vows* to the Contrary. And we will find other *Means* for them to obtain the *Grace* of *Continency*! Yes, and the World is full of the Effects of those *Means*! And know whether they are Better than those of *God's* Appointment!

It

[a] 1. Cor. vii. 9. [b] 1. Pet. iii. 2. [c] 1. Cor. vii. 2.

It is strange that you who have so many *Means* of *Grace* of your own, should not let those very few which *Christ* has made stand as He left them!

(41.) But you Extend yours further than He did His, for He appointed None to be Used for those in the other World: But you have *Offices* to deliver *Souls* out of *Purgatory*.

L. That seems a *Charitable* Office.

G. But it is a very *Dark* one. We have not a Word in *Scripture* of any such State of the *Dead*, where *Souls* are put under Pains equal to those of *Hell*, except for the Duration.

L. No *Unclean* thing can enter into *Heaven*.

G. Is not the *Blood* of Christ Sufficient to Cleans Us [a] *from all Unrighteousness*.

L. Yes, surely. But though God pardons the *Guilt* of *Sin*, yet His *Justice* will *Punish* in some Degree.

G. Then the *Guilt* is not fully Forgiven.

L. Not so, but that we may be *Punished* for it, as when *Afflictions*, *Diseases*, &c. are sent to us here upon Earth. God said to *David*, [b] *I have put away thy Sin, but the Child shall Die*.

G. And the Reason is given in the next Words, *because by this Deed thou hast given great Occasion to the Enemies of the Lord to Blaspheme*, as if God did Countenance such Wickedness; therefore *David* was Punished so as his Enemies might perceive it. God punishes here either to

[a] 1 *John*. 1. 9. [b] II. *Sam*. xii. 13.

to vindicate his own Honour before Men: Or for a Tryal of our *Faith*, as in the Case of *Job*, and to set forth such, as Examples to others: Or for a Proof and Confirmation of our *Religion*, as in the Case of the *Prophets* and *Apostles*, *Confessors* and *Martyrs*: Or to *Correct* and *Recal* Obstinate *Sinners*, many have been *Reformed* by this Means: But all these Reasons respect this Life only. For you say not that *Souls* are made Better in *Purgatory*, for you suppose them to die in the Love of *God*, and to be in His Favour, before they go thither. And why then are they Punished, since they are not Purified by it?

L. To satisfy the *Vindicative* Justice of God.

G. That is satisfy'd before they are Forgiven and Received into the Favour of God. Unless you mean by *Vindicative* such a *Spite* and *Revenge* as is seen among the most Ignoble Part of Mankind, to say, *I will forgive, but I will at the same time be Revenged for what is past.* Which indeed is not Forgiveness, but a plain Unwillingness to Forgive. But a generous Forgiveness, upon a sincere Repentance, *Loves* and *Embraces*, and *Rejoices* to *Comfort* and heap *Favours*, like the *Father* of the Returning *Prodigal.* God says, He will not (*a*) *Remember* our Sins, that they shall not be *Mentioned unto us, in the Day when we turn from our Wickedness.* And how is that consistent with enduring the Pains of *Hell* for a Hundred, perhaps a Thousand Years

(*a*) Isai. xliii. 25. Jer. xxxi. 34. Ezek. xviii. 22. xxxiii. 12. 16.

Years for ought we know? And how do we know what Souls go to *Purgatory*? How long they Remain there? And which of them are Released? Can *Prayers* then for the Releasment of such and such be made in *Faith*? Otherwise they are *Sin*, by the *Apostle*'s Determination.

L. But the *Intention* is *Pious*.

G. So it is in all *Superstition*, very *Pious*, and that is it which Deceives. But *God* has Required that our *Zeal* to *Him* should be *(b) according to Knowledge*. And that we (*c*) *intrude not into things we have not seen*. We have not seen any *Revelation* for *Purgatory*, or the State of *Souls* there.

L. But we have the *Tradition* of the *Church* for it.

G. Ther are Good and Bad *Traditions*. And they are much oftner taken in the Bad Sense throughout the *New Testament (d) Ye have made the Commandment of God of none Effect by your Tradition* ——— *Holding the Tradition of the Elders* —— *Laying aside the Commandment of God, ye hold the Tradition of Men* ———. *Ye Reject the Commandment of God, that ye may keep your own Tradition* —— (*e*) *Vain Deceit, after the Tradition of Men* ——— *Your vain Conversation received by Tradition from your Fathers*, &c.

Yet ther is a *Tradition* which (for the Evidence of it) we are willing to admit, that is, according to the Rule of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, *Quod*

(*b*) Rom. x. 2. (*c*) Col. ii. 18. (*d*) Matth. xv. 6. Mar. vii. 3, 8, 9. (*e*) Col. ii. 8. 1 Pet. i. 18.

Quod semper ubique, & ab omnibus, That which was always received, every where. and by all. And we are willing to join Issue with you upon this *Tradition* as to *Purgatory*. This is *Universal Tradition*. And you would not desire we should be concluded by any *Particular Tradition* of this or that *Church* or *Place*, for you know ther are many Deceits in such.

But *Veron* in his *Rule of Faith* (a Book much Applauded in *France*, and put into *English* for the Use of the *Roman Catholicks* here) sets out in the Beginning with a Definition of the *Rule of Faith*, of which he makes the first Requisit to be for any Article of *Faith*, that it be clearly *Revealed* in *Scripture* (and by no pretended *Revelation* since to any whatsoever) in express Words, or thence to be deduced by *Necessary Consequence*. Which when made appear as to *Purgatory* (or any other of the *Doctrines* in Dispute) we shall readily allow it. And till then, we cannot be Arraigned of *Heresy* for not Professing to Believe it.

This *intruding into things we have not seen*, proceeds, as the *Apostle* observes, from a [a] *Fleshly Mind*, Measuring *Spiritual* things by *Carnal*. We see it takes time to Purge the *Flesh* of Diseases and Defilements it has contracted and it takes a great deal of Filing and Scrubbing to Cleanse Iron that has been long *Rusted*. Hence we conjecture the same as to *Souls* departed, that they must be Purged by *Fire*. But the

[a] Coll. ii. 18.

the Work of *God* upon the *Soul*, when He grants true *Faith* and *Repentance* Operates far otherwise, it Effects the Cure of all at once, as with those who looked upon the *Brazen Serpent*. Our *Saviour* Himself (*b*) makes the Comparison. And he (*c*) gave us an Example of it in the *Thief* upon the *Cross*, who was translated to *Paradice* the same Day he Died. And yet he had been a grievous Sinner, and Suffered justly for his Offences; his Repentance was Late, and he had made no Restitution; yet he did no *Penance* in *Purgatory*.

L. That was an Extraordinary Case, his *Faith* must be very Strong to be Converted upon the *Cross*.

G. That is more than we know, whether he might not have been Converted before. But however, it shews ther is no Necessity for *Purgatory*, even for very great Offenders.

L. No doubt *God* may Excuse whom He pleases.

G. How then do we know Whom He excuses, and whom not? And how can we Pray in *Faith*, that is, without *Sin*, to Deliver such a particular *Person* from thence?

But if there be no *Necessity* for it, as you have Granted in the Case of the *Thief*, how is it to be Imagined that *God* should keep so many Thousand *Souls*, for many Years or Ages, in the most Extreme *Torments*, when there was no *Necessity* for it? And if the *Pope* has Power to Release

(*b*) Joh. iii. 14, 15. (*c*) Luk. xxiii. 43.

Release out of *Purgatory*, he must be a very Cruel *Father* who keeps one *Soul* there an Hour longer.

L. We see the *Church* imposing *Penance* and yet Excusing some, Shortning the Time more than to others.

G. The *Church* knows not the *Heart*, and must Judge by *Signs*, which yet Secure not from *Hypocrisie*. But this is all Foreign as to *God*, who searcheth the *Heart*, and knoweth all that is in Man. And tho' our *Physick* of *Disciplin* works by Degrees, and the Issue is uncertain; yet *God* never *Cures* Imperfectly, *Christ* never *Half-Healed* any Man. And so it is when He pardons Sinners, (*a*) *Thy Sins are forgiven thee*. It is not said, *shall be* forgiven, or when thou hast performed such and such *Penance*, but the *Forgiveness* of his *Sins* was as Immediately wrought as the *Cure* of his *Body*. And *God* gives us all the Assurances that can be, in the Strongest Expressions, of our *Sins* being Absolutely and Totally *Forgiven*, as being (*b*) *all Blotted out, all cast into the Depths of the Sea*. Never to be *Remembred* or *Mentioned unto us* any more, as before quoted. *I will Heal* (*c*) *their Backsliding, I will Love them freely*. He is *Ready to Forgive*. He *Waiteth to have Mercy*. He *earnestly Remembreth*, His *Bowels are troubled* for Sinners that they may Repent, and *in the Day they turn from their Wickedness*, He *Forgiveth*.

(*a*) Luk. v. 20. (*b*) Psal. li. 9. Isai. xliv. 22. Col. ii. 14. Mic. vii. 19. (*c*) Hos. xiv. 4. Psal. lxxxvi. 5. Isai. xxx. 18. Jer. xxxi. 20. Ezek. xxxiii. 12. Lam. iii. 33.

eth. For He doth not afflict willingly, nor Grieve the Children of Men. It is for their Repentance and Reformation, but that Consideration is not in *Purgatory*.

But how will the poor Souls there (if any are there) be Deluded, if the Stock of *Supererogation* should fail them, that is, the *Merits* of *Saints* for their *good Works* which they have done, over and above their *Duty*, and what they were obliged to for their own *Salvation*, and therefore are Applyed to others who hall come short of their Duty, to supply their Deficiencies; which is the Fund provided for the Discharge of the Prisoners in *Purgatory*? And this is Dispensed by the *Pope* to whom he thinks fit, as being the Grand *Treasurer* of the *Church*, and Consequently of these Super-Abundant *Merits* of the *Saints*. But we want a *Text* where St. *Peter* was Constitured such a *Treasurer*. Or that there is or can be any such *Treasury*. For can a Creature *Merit* at the Hands of God, for ever so Great Endowments bestowed upon him? Is it a *Merit* to *Receive* great Gifts? And if we Employ them to the best Advantage, is it more than is our *Duty* to do? And we are still (*a*) *unprofitable Servants*, as *Christ* Himself has told us. But was there ever a Man (*Christ* only excepted) who did all his *Duty*? Are not all *Sinners*? And if their *Repentance* entitle them to *Pardon*, yet this is far from *Merit*. My doing my Duty

(*a*) Luk. xvii. 10.

Duty to Day, makes no Amends for my having Neglected it Yesterday. We find the greatest *Saints* applying to the *Mercy* of *God*, and not pleading their own *Merits*. *Jacob* said, [a] *I am not worthy of the least of all thy Mercies*, And *Job* who had [b] *None like him in the Earth, a Perfect and Upright Man*, &c. said, *I abhor my self, and Repent in Dust and Ashes.* And *Daniel*, the Man [c] *greatly Beloved*, Confessed his own Sins, as well as the Sins of the People. And St. *Paul* called himself the [d] *Chief* of *Sinners* not worthy to be an *Apostle*, &c. And if the *Saints* own no *Merit* in themselves, then surely they will Disown all those who Apply to their *Merits*; and, as I said before concerning the *Worship* and *Invocation* of them, by which you hope to Gain them to be *Intercessors* for you, they must become your *Accusers*, by their Denial of their Acceptance of such *Worship* from you, which if they should Accept, it would make them *Evil Spirits*, as I have Quoted out of St. *Augustine*.

But what *Creature* dare plead *Purity* before *God*? [f] *Behold He chargeth His Angels with Folly, and he putteth no Trust in His Saints; yea the Heavens are not Clean in His Sight. How much more Abominable and Filthy is Man, who drinketh Iniquity like Water*? And *what is Man that he should be Clean? And he that is born of a Woman, that he should be Righteous*? And if *All*

---

[a] Gen. xxxii. 10. [b] Job. 1. 8. xlii. 6. [c] Dan. ix. 20. 23.
[d] 1. Tim. 1. 15. 1. Cor. xv. 9. [e] Job, iv. 18. xv. 15.

All [a] *our Righteousness are as filthy Rags.* If there be [b] *Iniquity* in our *Holy* things, in the *Holy Sanctuary* and *Alter.* What then is Clean? [c] *And if the Righteous* themselves shall *scarcely be saved,* What *Merits* have they to spare for others? Especially when they are not saved even by their own Works. [d] *For by Grace ye are saved—— not of Works, lest any Man should Boast.* Can any Man then Boast of his *Works,* as not only sufficient for his own Salvation, but over and above as *Meritorious* to be Applyed to others, and to Deliver Souls out of *Purgatory?* No, my Lord, the *Saints* make no such Boasts. And will Disown all those who make them in their Name. For they know that [e] *All have Sinned, and come short of the Glory of God; being Justified freely by His Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ—— Where is boasting then? It is Excluded. By what Law; Of Works? Nay, but by the Law of Faith.* And every Man is Saved by his own *Faith,* not by the *Faith* of others. And God will [f] *Reward every Man according to his Works,* not the *Works* of others. Miserable then is the Condition of those Souls supposed to be in *Purgatory* if they must not thence be Delivered but by Works of *Supererogation,* when no Man can be saved by his own Works, for *We are saved*---[g] *Not according to our Works, but according to the Grace of God in Christ Jesus.*

N [a]

[a] Isai. lxiv. 6. [b] Exod. xxviii. 38. Lev. xvi. 33. [c] 1 Pet. iv. 18. [d] Eph. ii. 8. 9. [e] Rom. iii. 23, 24, 27. [f] Matth. xvi. 27. [g] ii. Tim. i. 9.

[a] *Not by Works of Righteousness which we have done, but according to His Mercy He saved us — through* Jesus Christ *our Saviour.* We have no other *Saviour*, nor can be Saved by the *Merits* of any other. None other can *Merit* from *God.* The greatest *Saint* that ever was is saved only by *Mercy*, and the Forgiveness of his *Sins.* Let us therefore not Trust to the *Supererogated* Works of those, which were not able to save Themselves. [b] *That every Mouth may be stopped, and all the World may become Guilty before God.* [c] *For in His Sight shall no Man living be Justified. Ther is none Righteous, no not one.*

But besides all this, there are Degrees of Glory in Heaven. So that if any could *Supererogate*, yet has he nothing to spare to others, because, he has Received the full of his Reward himself. This shuts up *Purgatory* for Ever, by Exhausting every Penny of that *Treasury* reserved for Redemption from thence.

And the Expectation of having those many Sins called *Venial* with you Remitted after Death, does naturally make Men more Careless in their Life. And trusting to the *Merits* of others, will Abate their Diligence in being nicely Righteous themselves.

L. But we find some Instances among the *Fathers* of *Prayers* for *the Dead.*

G. Some few among the *Fathers* you may, but none in *Scripture.* But what were these *Prayers*

[a] Tit. ii. 5, 6. [b] Rom. iii. 19. [c] Psal. cxiv. 2.

Prayers? They were for *Peace* and *Rest* to those who were Supposed to be in *Peace*, yet might receive Increase of Happiness even before the *Resurrection*, as some suppose *Heaven* it self to Consist in an Eternal *Increase of Bliss*. But without this, We may Pray for Continuance of *Peace* to those who are in *Peace*, though we know it will surely be; as when we Pray *Thy Kingdom come. Thy Will be done.* We know it must be, but this shews our Assent and Wishes for it. And in this Sense we also Pray for the *Dead*, That it would please God, [a] *shortly to Accomplish the Number if His Elect and to hasten His Kingdom, that we, with all those that are Departed in the true Faith of His Holy Name, may have our perfect Consummation and Bliss, both in Body and Soul, in His Eternal and Everlasting Glory.* And we Bless Him, [b] *for all His Servants Departed this Life, in His Faith and Fear; beseeching Him to give us Grace so to follow their good Examples, that, with them, we may be Partakers of His Heavenly Kingdom.* So that we Pray for Them as well as for our Selves, that we *with them*, may be Partakers, *&c.* But neither these Prayers of ours nor those of the Ancients, have any Relation to *Purgatory* or delivering Souls from thence, as from a Place of *Torment*.

Some of the Ancients had an Imagination of a Purging *Fire* through which Sinners were

[a] *Order for the Burial of the Dead.* [b] *Communion Office.* Prayer for the *Church Militant.*

to pass, but they meant the General *Conflagration* at the Last Day. Which comes not at all to your Notion of *Purgatory*. But I would not trouble your Lordship with Excursions, or Debating every Branch of these Disputes, only give you a Summary View of the Heart of the Cause, and to see where the Matter Pinches. And indeed, my Lord, my Endeavour with your Lordship is rather to State the Case, than to Argue upon it; for *Truth* needs no more than to be fairly Shewn, it Convinces of it self; and Best when it is *Naked*, without the *Fucus* of *Philosophy* and *Distinctions* which are Endless.

These will put a Colour upon *Implicit* it self, and make you believe you Understand what you know nothing of! My Lord, give me Leave to say, your whole Religion is *Implicit*, not only as to the particular *Points* we have Discoursed, but your whole *Publick Worship* is such, while your *Prayers* are in a *Language* not Understood by the *People*. How then can they [a] *Pray with the Understanding*, as the *Apostle* requires? And *how can they say Amen, seeing they Understand not what is said*?

L. They have *Prayers* of their own, and carry little *Prayer Books* with them which they Read while the *Priest* is Repeating the *Publick Offices*.

G. But this is not Joining with the *Priest*, and they cannot say *Amen* to his Prayers.

What

[a] 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16.

What then have they to do at *Church*? This is not *Communion*. It is purely *Implicit*, and nothing else but *Opus Operatum*. It is an *Invention* without *Precedent*, for it never Entered into the Head of *Man* or *Church* since the Creation except only the *Church* of *Rome*. And of which the Apostle gives this Character, [a] *Will they not say ye are Mad*?

What is it short of this which *Suarez* says? [b] *That it is not necessary to Prayer that the Person Praying should think of what he speaks.* This is *Opus Operatum*, with a Witness! And a *Parrat* may be taught thus to *Pray*. And how do they *Pray* with the *Priest*, who are talking of *Business*, or Chatting of *News* while he is Offering up their *Prayers* to *God*, in a *Language* of which they Understand not one Word, and therefore cannot give Attention to it? And these are the Greatest Number, *viz.* of the Common People who cannot Read, and so cannot carry Private *Books* of *Devotion* with them; though if they did, it would not be *Joining* with the *Priest*, nor could these be called *Common Prayer*, which are Offered up with *One Accord*, pursuant to St. *Chrysostom*'s Prayer, with which our daily *Publick Prayers* do Conclude.

And now, My Lord, upon the Whole, if the Advantage does not seem to your Lordship to lye on our side, in all the Particulars

 before

[a] *Ibid.* ver. 23. [b] *De Orat* lib. 3. c. 14. and *Salmeron.* &c.

before Mentioned; yet can you have any Doubt of the Safety of your Soul in our way? Since all our Danger is, Omitting some things that might be *Profitable*, but cannot be called *Necessary*: Whereas if the Error lyes on your Side, you are Involved in Manifold *Superstitions*, and of Adding to and Substracting from the *Word of God*.

L. I confess nothing sticks with me but the *Church*, of being in the *Church*, and preserving the *Unity* of the *Church*.

G. Therefore I began with that, and desire to Close with it, for it is the *Jugulum Causæ*.

I have shewed wherein the *Unity* of the *Church* did Consist, according to the Institution of *Christ*, and as the Primitive *Fathers* Understood it, that is, an *Unity* in *Faith*, and in the Mutual *Love* and good *Correspondence* of *Christians* and *Sister Churches*; though one *Sister* must be *Elder* than another, and *Rome* was not the *Eldest*: One might be *Greater* or more *Powerful* than another, and this did vary, according to the Course of this World: *Jerusalem* was at first the only *Church* of *Christ*, than *Antioch* became the Greatest of the *Gentle Church*, where *Christianity* first Received its Name, afterwards *Rome* became the Greatest, from being the *Seat* of the *Roman Empire*, but *Constantinople* was the first Assumed an *Universal Supremacy*, when she became the *Head* of that *Empire*. And this was it which Broke the *Unity* of the *Sister Churches*, and filled them with *Schisms* and *Divisions* among themselves

themselves, one Affecting *Superiority* over another, and Encreasing it to an Absolute *Temporal* Dominion. Of which *Christ* said to the Apostles, [a] *It shall not be so among you.* And again, (for they Contended more than once for the *Superiority*) after the Institution and Celebration of the Holy *Eucharist*, just as He was going to Enter upon His Sacred *Passion*, and to take His final Leave of them, this Dispute arose again, *Which of them should be the Greatest*, and that was the Time to Determine it if Ever, but He again Checked their Ambition, and the Error of their Thought, as if the *Church* were to be Governed with *Temporal* Sway and Authority, like the Grandeur of Secular *Princes*, but told them plainly [b] *Ye shall not be so.*

And in His farewel Sermon, continued upon the same Occasion, and at the same Time, He insisted much upon their *Unity*, and Placed it, not upon the *Superiority* of any One of them over the Others, but in their Mutual *Love* and good Agreement with Each other, in their *Union* with *God* and with *Himself*, upon which He wonderfully Expatiates in most Exalted Words, which take up four whole Chapters in S. *John*, and begins, (c) *Little Children, yet a little while I am with you—— A new Commandment I give unto you, That ye Love one another— By this shall all Men know that ye are My Disciples, if ye have Love one to another.* This is the *Unity* of which *Christ*

 speaks

[a] Matth. xx. 25. [b] Luk. xxii. 26. [c] Joh. xiii. 33.

ſpeaks in theſe His laſt Words to the *Apoſtles*. He ſaid, [a] *My Kingdom is not of this World: If my Kingdom were of this World, then would my Servants Fight* —— But he that calls himſelf *Servus Servorum*, the *Servant* of His *Servants*, has *Fought*, and Raiſed bloody *Wars* in Defence, as he ſays, of this his Maſter's *Kingdom!* And he will have the *Government* of it juſt the ſame as of other *Kingdoms* of the World, and its *Unity* to Conſiſt, like theirs, in being under one Abſolute and Deſpotick *Head* or *King*. But no *Kingdom* of the Earth will Content him. He will be *Univerſal Monarch* of the whole World. And why? Becauſe *Chriſt* is the *Head* of all *Churches*, and therefore muſt have an *Univerſal Vicar*. And from the ſame Parity of Reaſon, becauſe [b] *God is the King of all the Earth*, therefore He muſt have an *Univerſal Vicar* in *Temporals*. And if *England*, *France*, *Spain*, &c. ſhould Contend which of them were this *Univerſal Vicar*, would not the Anſwer be Eaſy? That the Conteſt was fooliſh and vain, for though one *Kingdom* might be *Greater* or more *Ancient* than another, yet was it ſtill but a *Part* of the *Whole*, that is of the *World*. And that *God* had Appointed no ſuch *Univerſal Vicar*. The Caſe is exactly Parallel, unleſs it can be ſhewed, that *Chriſt* has Appointed ſuch an *Univerſal Vicar* in the *Church*; And told us Plainly who it is, that we may obey

[a] Joh. xviii. 36. [b] Pſal. xlvii. 7.

obey Him. Which when done, we will own our selves *Hereticks*, *Schismaticks*, and what you will, till we Return and Pay our Obedience to Him.

But on the other hand, if *Christ* has Appointed no such *Universal Vicar*, then are you under a Mortal *Mistake* concerning the *Unity* of the *Church*, which you Place wholly upon our being *United* in Obedience to such an One. And your *Church* is the Great Breaker of Ecclesiastical *Unity*, while she will bear no *Sister Church*, but will be the *Mother* of all *Churches*, though she be not the *Eldest*.

This, My Lord, is the very *Heart* of the *Cause*. And we are verily Persuaded that ther is not the least Ground for this *Universal Supremacy*, either in the Holy *Scriptures*, or in *Antiquity*, or in the *Reason* of the Thing, or in *Fact*, since the first Foundation of *Christianity* to this Day, or that it was ever Acknowledged, or is Now, by the Majority of Christian *Churches*. And yet this is the Foundation of all the Disputes betwixt your *Church* and ours, and all other *Christian Churches*.

Christ forsaw the Consequences of trusting an *Universal Supremacy* in the Hands of *Fallible* Men. An *Universal King* must Ruin the World, for *Appeals* to Him must lye in all Causes from all the Parts of the Earth, and Men must Attend with their *Witnesses*, and all other things Necessary to carry on a *Law Suit*. The *Oppression* of this (beyond all other *Tyranries*) may Appear by the *Appeals*

peals to *Rome*, in the times of *Popery*, no further than from *England* thither, where *Causes* lasted from Age to Age, loudly Complained of in those Times and Attempts made to Restrain it in some Measure by several of our *Acts of Parliament*, but not to Purpose till the *Reformation*: And this indeed made the *Reformation* even *Necessary*, for the Preservation of the *People*, as well *Laity* as *Clergy*, who Groaned under this *Burden* which neither they nor their Fathers were able to Bear. Dr. *Parker* late Lord Bishop of *Oxford*, in his Excellent *Discourse sent to the late King James*, when he was *Arch Deacon* of *Canterbury*, Printed here in the Year 1690, says upon this Head, p. 29. *I my self enjoy a small Office in this Church, wherein my Predecessors had a Suit for a Privilege belonging to it, hanging in the Court of Rome for some Hundreds of Years, till the very Time of the Dissolution of the Pope's Power.* Hence we may Judge how it would be with the *Churches*, in the *Indies* and the most Remote Places in the *World*, if it were All under his Power, as he Pretends! But the Good *Providence* of *God* has not Suffered it to Extend to Half of the Christian *Churhces* (as before is said) and His *Wisdom* and *Goodness* has still Preserved the *Major* Part true *Protestants* against this *Usurpation*; besides the great Number He has Rescued from it, and has never Suffered any of these Reformed *Churches* or *Nations* to Return to it again, as before has been Observed: And besides that the *Principle* it self,

ſelf, and the *Pretenſions* of the *Pope* to this *Univerſal* and *Unlimited Supremacy* are Beat down and Exploded by the *Gallican Church*, and others the moſt Learned who ſtill Remain in his *Communion* whether he will or not, and though he *Excommunicates* them afreſh every Year!

And now, My Lord, I cannot but think it made Plain to a Demonſtration, that this *Univerſal Supremacy* is a thing Impracticable; and that if it could be in *Fact*, it would be the greateſt Ruin and Oppreſſion to the *Church* that is Poſſible. And if an *Univerſal King* would be Inſupportable to the *World*. how much more an *Univerſal Biſhop* to the *Church*? For he muſt have an Abſolute *Dominion* over our *Faith*, over the Holy *Scriptures*, and over the *Church*, which muſt ſuddenly Fall (as I before quoted *Gregory* the Great) if it comes to depend upon One. And that whoever ſhould Aſſume it, would be as he Propheſied a *Lucifer*, and the fore-runner of *Anti-Chriſt*. And can he be leſs, if he has *Uſurped* ſo vaſt an *Authority*, and *Infallibity* it ſelf to ſupport it.

I ſaid before, that an *Univerſal King* would make all *Wars* to be *Rebellion*, and ſo Incurable but by utter Deſtruction. Thus it is with the *Univerſal Biſhop*, Oppoſing his *Supremacy* is *Hereſy*, *Schiſm*, and *Excommunication*: And is the only *Article* in your *Creed* to be Believed *Explicitly*, as for the others, *Implicit* will do for them all! That is, it is no Matter

whether

whether you Believe them or not, so the *Sovereignty* of the *Universal Bishop* be Maintained Inviolably!

But though every *King* is not a *Bishop*, yet the *Universal Bishop* must likewise be *Universal King*, with Power to *Depose* all *Kings* at his Pleasure. Of this I have spoke at large.

And though nothing need be said to this Almighty *Claim*, both in *Spirituals* and *Temporals*, but to put you to the Proof of its *Institution* by *Christ*, who Disowned all *Civil* Power *Himself*, and said, [a] *Who made me a Judge?* Yet I have gone further, (that this Cause might be put out of all Dispute) and shewed the Inconsistency of your own *Claim* to be the only *Catholick Church*, and to Enjoy the true *Unity* of it, in these Particulars following.

1. Ther never was a *Church* called *Catholick*, in the Sense of *Rome*, that is, which was owned by all other *Churches* as their *Head*, at least since that of *Jerusalem*.

L. But we admit none other to be *Christian Churches* but those who do own it.

G. That is to say, it must do one way or other, if the *Mountain* will not come to *Mahomet*, *Mahomet* must go to the *Mountain*. It is like the Bed *Procrustes* made to fit all Persons, by *Stretching* those to the *Length* of it who were *Shorter*, and *Cutting* off Part of those who were *Longer* than it. Thus the *Church* of *Rome* becomes *Universal*, by *Stretching* her *Communion* to those who

[a] Luk. xii. 14.

who stand *Excommunicated* by her; and *Cutting* of all *Churches* who will not own her *Supremacy*. And thus she must be still *Universal*, though she had no more left than the *Diocess* of *Rome*; or suppose none but the *Pope* himself, than He would be the *Universal Church*! And it may well be Preserved in a *Pope*, if it may in one *Laick*, a *Woman* or an *Infant*.

2. And then ther will be perfect *Unity*. And I am afraid not till then; for perfect *Unity* is not only in outward *Communion*, that is, being within the same *Walls* together: Or in Subscribing a *Formula* of *Articles* of *Faith*, half of which must be believed *Implicitly*: But an *Unity* likewise in *Saving* or *Damning Principles* and *Practices*, in *Love* and *Charity*, for which Chiefly we shall be [a] Judged at the Last Day. If these are wanting, the *Unity* will be very *Imperfect*, and stand us in little Stead.

3. Ther ought to be also an *Unity* where to place your *Infallibility* (else it is None) of which I have given four *Schemes*, each one Contradictory to all the Rest, and not yet Determined by your *Church*. And this is an *Unity* in *Faith* among you. It is the *Foundation* upon which your *Church* is Built.

4. There must be an *Unity* and full Agreement which of the *Articles* of your *Creed* are to be believed *Explicitly*, and which *Implicitly*, that is indeed which are Necessary to be Believed, and which not? Without this, your *Faith* is wholly Uncertain. And

[a] Matth. xxv. 31. &c.

And till these things be adjusted, you cannot be said to have *Unity* even in *Faith*.

And if you have not *Unity* in *Faith*; nor in those *Principles* and *Practices* which are no less Necessary to *Salvation*; Nor in that *Love* and *Charity* which *Christ* has made the *Characteristick* of *Christians*, and without which [a] no Man can know who are His *Disciples*: But instead of that, if you have Envyings and Strife among you, among your several Religious *Orders*, betwixt National and National *Church*, concerning the *Infallibility* and *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, and of his Power to Depose *Princes*, upon which the *Peace* and *Unity* of the *World*, and our eternal *Salvation* does depend; and in short, if you have no *Unity* concerning your *Rule* of *Faith* it self, or of your *Practice*, what will the *Unity* of Outward *Communion* do, upon which you lay the whole Stress? It will not so much as Denominate you *Christians*, far less to be the only *Christians* in the World, or the *Catholick Church*.

It is true that *Unity* in *Communion* is a Desirable thing, and ought to be preserved among all *Churches*; but it is still a Part only of the *Unity* of the *Church*, as I have shewed. And that the *Supremacy* of the *Pope* has been the Chief Cause of the Breach of it. But yet it is not such a Breach as Destroys all other Parts of the *Unity* of the *Church*, their *Unity* in One *Lord*, One *Faith*, One *Baptism*. It may be called an Essential Part of the *Perfect Unity* of the *Church*, but,

[a] Joh. xiii. 35.

but, Alas! What is *Perfect* upon Earth? And it is not so *Essential* as that the Want of it should quite *Un-Church*; so that if ther were not a *Church* upon Earth that did *Communicate* with another, yet they would not all Cease, for that Cause only, to be *Christian Churches*. As if all the *Nations* in the World were at *War* with each other, yet it would be the same *World* still, and *God*'s One *Kingdom* upon Earth, and each *Nation* a Part of it.

L. But the *Unity* of the *Church* ought to be more than that of the *Temporal* World.

G. True. But we say, *Magis & Minus non variant Speciem*, that *More* or *Less* alter not the *Kind*, as a greater or less Quantity of *Gold* (for Example) alters not the *Species* of the *Gold*. So *Unity* is *Unity*, be it more or less. And ther is an *Unity* among all *Nations*, even though at *War*, the *Unity* of *Blood*, and of *Reason*, being all made of one *Blood*, and all endowed with the same *Reason*, which makes them all Agree in some Common *Principles*, and all Appeal to *Reason* in the *Justice* of their *Wars*. But this *Unity* is not *Perfect* while they Bite and Devour one another.

And though the *Unity* is Greater, where *Revelation* is added to *Reason*, and Men agree in the same *Religion* which we call the *Church*; yet this *Unity* is not *Perfect*, while ther are *Disputes*, *Animosities*, and various *Opinions* about it. And in the Church of *Rome* herself ther are great Variety of *Opinions* among

those

those of her *Communion*, and *Animosities* thereupon Raised, so Great as gives her much Trouble to Compose, and sometimes finds it past her Power, and is forced to Bear what she cannot Remedy.

L. What do you mean then by the *Holy Catholick Church* in the *Creed?*

G. This *Article* was but late put into the *Creed*, on occasion of Divisions which arose among the *Churches*, to mind them that they were all *Members* of the same *Body*, of the one *Catholick Church*. The next *Article* Explains this, and may be called a Part of it, *viz. The Communion of Saints*, and these are only the *Elect*, who are not visible upon *Earth*; and therefore must be Referred to *Heaven*, where only is the true *Communion of Saints*, without Mixture of the *Reprobate*, who are not *Members* of *Christ*, and but in Appearance of the *Church*. We have no *Unity* of the *Spirit* with these, and Consequently are not one *Body* with them: [a] For what *Fellowship* hath *Righteousness* with *Unrighteousness?* And what *Communion* hath *Light* with *Darkness?* And what *Concord* hath *Christ* with *Belial?* And what *Unity* hath that *Church* where these are mixed together? Therefore the *Archetypal* and truly *Catholick Church* in *Heaven*, is That which is Chiefly and Principally meant by the *Holy Catholick Church*, and the *Communion of Saints* in the *Creed*. And *There* only is perfect *Unity*. *There*

[a] ii. Cor. vi. 14.

There is the Great *Body* of the *Church*, there are but few at a time upon *Earth*, and of them we know not which belong to that truely *Catholick Church* or not. And who do not, cannot be truly *Catholicks*, though they bear that Name with us. And of them so Called, you your selves will not say that there is Perfect *Unity* among them, in all the *Necessary* and most *Essential* Parts of it before Mentioned.

But if that Article in the *Creed* had been meant in your Sense, it must have been the *Holy Roman Catholick Church*, and not left us to seek where to find this *Church*, the *Infallible Guide*. And you your selves have not found it, while you are in quite Contrary Opinions where to find it. But by leaving it in the General and Indefinitely under the Name of the *Catholick Church* only, it is rather Exclusive of any Particular *Church*, and Extends to all *Christian Churches*, which make up the *Catholick Church* upon Earth, in such an *Unity* as our Fallen State will bear, where Human *Passions* are not Subdued, but mix themselves in our *Religious* as well as *Temporal* Concerns. Therefore by the *Unity* of the *Church* you cannot mean a *Perfect Unity*; no not even with your *Head*, and in *Doctrines* which are Indispensible towards your Eternal *Salvation*, as in the *Deposing Doctrine*, upon which the Apostle has Pronounced *Damnation*; and which, if not True, Cardinal *Perron*, as before Quoted, gives up the *Church* of *Rome*, for many Ages

past, for the very *Synagogue* of *Antichrist*. See also the *Morals* of the *Jesuits*, which though Condemned by some, are Defended by others. This is not *Perfect Unity*, even in *Necessaries*; and the *Bulla in Cœna* breaks it to pieces, where whole *Churches* and *Nations* are *Excommunicated* of those you say are in the *Unity* of the *Church*, and in his *Communion* who has *Excommunicated* them!

But if we will be Content with no *Unity* in the *Church* but what is *Perfect* in all things, the Consequence must be, that we have no *Unity* at all. As our Pretence to *Infallibility* is the greatest Instance of our *Fallibility*. And if we will have no *Guide* but who is *Infallible*, we must have none upon Earth. And so the *Church* is render'd wholly useless to us, if we may not take their Help, as *Instructors* and Rational *Guides*, or in the *Apostles* Words, as (*a*) *Helpers of our Joy*, without giving them the *Dominion over our Faith*.

And indeed the Security you demand of an outward *Infallible* Guide, is Altering the Course of *Nature*, or as I called it, finding fault with the *Creation*; for *God* has made us *Rational* Creatures, and given us no other Guide but our own *Reason*, with the Assistance of His *Grace*, to come at the Knowledge of *Himself*, and Consequently of all other things. And to find fault with this, is the *Clay* saying to

(*a*) 2 Cor. 1. 24.

to the *Potter*, *Why hast thou made me thus!* To bid us Divest our selves wholly of our *Reason*, or to Believe *Implicitly*, which is the same thing; and is not in our Power, whatever we may think, because *Reason* is our *Nature*; and that we should not believe our Outward *Senses*, is indeed to make us other *Creatures* than *God* has Made us. And to Refuse the Assistance of a *Church*, because she is not *Infallible*, is Depriving our selves of a *Means* which *God* has Appointed; and is the same Perversness, as if we should refuse to consult a *Lawyer* or *Physician*, because it is Possible they may Err in their Judgment. But tho' I allow their Skill to be better than mine, in their several Professions, yet we still keep to our selves so much Use of our *Reason*, that if I knew it was *Poyson* the *Physician* were going to give me, I would not take it: And ther are some things so plain, that no *Lawyer* could Persuade me to. Much more ought we to be careful in our *Eternal* Concerns, and not to give our selves up *Implicitly* to any whatsoever, that if they should Direct us against the most Express Commands in *Scripture*, or the Dictates of *Reason* and Common *Morality*, or bid us Deny all our *Senses*, we must Acquiesce without Examining! This is Abandoning both *Sense* and *Reason* which *God* gave us as a *Guide*, and therefore will Require it of us; and this only is that which will render us *Self-Condemned*, and bear Witness against us at the Last Day: For as I said, It is not in our Power? to Extinguish *Rea-*

ſon in us, tho' we may Blindfold it and keep it down for a time, yet it will Recoil upon us, and Convict us, wherein we have Departed from it. Without this there could not be ſuch a thing as a *Sting* of *Conſcience*, for what is that but a *Check* to our *Reaſon*? What elſe is *Repentance*, or Returning from any *Error*, or from any *Evil* we have done? You endeavour to Convert Men to your *Church* wholly upon their *Reaſon*, for you can have no other Topick whereby to lay hold of an Adverſary: In vain therefore would you perſuade him to Truſt to that *Choice* of his *Reaſon* in Coming over to you, but never to Truſt any other *Choice* his *Reaſon* ſhould make afterwards, becauſe it is very *Fallible*; I ſay this could not go down with any Man, but it muſt make him Doubt whether his *Reaſon* has Led him Right in the firſt *Choice* too of going to your *Church*, and from the ſame Argument, becauſe his *Reaſon* is very *Fallible*. God ſays to us [a] *Come now and let us Reaſon together*. We ask no more of you. Nay, you cannot Refuſe it us, whether you will or not; for your own *Reaſon* will, as I ſaid, one time or other Return upon you, and Convince you of Obſtinacy in not hearkening to *Reaſon*, for without this you cannot be ſaid to have Acted according to *Reaſon*. This renders me Inexcuſable, whether I be *Right* or *Wrong*; for if my *Reaſon* Miſleads me after due *Examination*,

[a] Iſac. i, 18.

on, the *Error* is *Human*, and will be more easily Pardoned, but if I will not *Hear*, I will not open my *Eyes*, it mkes me *Guilty* though I were in the *Right*, because that is by *Chance*, and not my *Choice* upon *Reasonable Conviction*, which I have Refused. And *Truth* is never Afraid, for the more it is Canvassed it Appears the Brighter. It is strange to see those who Pretend to such an Assurance as is *Infallible*, and yet seek to Avoid the Light of *Reason*, as if Afraid of being Detected! And to Confess it in the very Body of their *(a) Canon Law*, where they *Excommunicate* any *Laick*, who shall Publickly or Privately Dispute concerning the *Catholick Faith*.

This Method will secure to them all that they have Caught: But if observed by others as well as by themselves, they would never Catch another. And it is a plain Indication that who are against *Reason*, *Reason* is against them.

For if *Reason* could be heard, it would make it very Obvious to you, That in all the particular Points before mention'd, the *Certainty* is on our Side, and the *Doubt* (at least) on yours. For Example, None make a *Doubt* but that we may lawfully Pray to *God*, and not before any *Image* of Him: Or without the

(a) *Inhibemus quoque ne cuicumque Laica personæ liceat publice vel privatim de Fide Catholica disputare. Qui vero contra fecerit, Excommunicationis laqueo innodetur.*
Corp Jer. Can. Sext. Decretal. lib. Quint. Tit. ii. cap. ii. § 1. Paris. 1687.

Worſhip or Invocation of any *Saint* joined with Him; and ſo of all the Reſt. But on your part, if what I have ſaid make them not appear unlawful to your Lordſhip, yet they muſt remain at leaſt *Doubtful*, till ſome ſtronger *Evidence* be produced for them than has hitherto been given. There is not a Prayer in the Publick *Offices* of our *Church* to which you may not heartily ſay *Amen*, in full *Faith* and Aſſurance: Which is Impoſſible to ſay as to *Purgatory*, Invocation of *Saints*, &c. And then ſuch *Prayers* muſt be *Sinful*. *Rom.* xiv. 23.

But you are Pinned down in all theſe particular Points by the Authority of a ſuppoſed *Univerſal Biſhop*, wherein likewiſe you place the *Unity* of the *Church*. And yet ther never was ſuch a *Biſhop*, or Univerſal *Monarch*, unleſs any *Prince* calling himſelf ſo, would make him ſuch. What is an *Univerſal Monarch* who was never owned by Half of thoſe he calls his *Subjects*? And whoſe *Authority* is *Limited* and *Reſtrained*, and his *Excommunications* Deſpiſed, by thoſe who Pretend to own him, and to be Subject to him? What is it to Fancy ones ſelf *King* of all the *Earth*? And to place the *Unity* of the *World* in ſuch a *Monarch* as never was in the World? And to call thoſe *Rebels* from him, who never were in *Subjection* to him? This, My Lord, I have ſhewed to be the Caſe of the Greateſt Part of the *Chriſtian Churches*, and from the Beginning. And conſequently this *Univerſal Supremacy* is meerly *Imaginary*. It was never Na-

med

med by *Christ*, nor ever was in Fact. And so far is it from being the *Center* of *Unity*, that the Pretence to it has been the Great *Breach* of *Unity* among *Christian Churches*, and is at this Day: For this is it which stops the *Bishops* in the Communion of *Rome* from Exercising the Freedom of their own Judgments, and that *Authority* which *Christ* has given them over their own Flocks, and will Require an Account of it from them; and which was freely Exercised by the *Bishops* in the Primitive Church; and which, if Restored, would open the way to that *Catholick Communion* so greatly Desired, and wherein the true *Unity* of the *Church* does Consist. Which never can be Hoped, while a *Negative* is given to the *Pope* in all the particular Points disputed, and especially concerning his own *Supremacy*. But if the *Bishops* of his Communion would think themselves at Liberty and under Obligation to Act of themselves, as in the Primitive *Church*; and as ordained by *Christ*; the Points we have Discoursed as to *Doctrine* and *Worship* seem to me so very Plain, that ther could be no Dispute, which were the Safer Side to take: At least that it would not be thought a *Sin* so to Purge their Publick *Offices* as that other *Christians* might lawfully join in them; And let *Opinions* remain as *Opinions*, not made *Articles* of *Faith*, and *Conditions* of *Communion*. And to this nothing stands in the Way of the *Bishops* of *France*, at least, but the fear of that *Excommunication* from the *Pope* which is Renewed against them eve-

ry Year, and which they Pretend not to Regard. But they are kept under by the Shadow of the Phantom of an *Universal Supremacy*, which never was in Being; and if it were, would be Insupportable and Ruin the *Church*; and which they themselves have in Effect already Rejected, as Inconsistent with the Liberties of the *Gallican* or any other *National* Church; and has bred all the Dispute betwixt them and the *Church* of *Rome*. And can never be Healed in good Earnest, if the *Pope* be Judge of the Controversy. See then the Cause of the *Breach* of *Catholick* Unity.

And now, My Lord, forgive me, for I am sensible that ther is an Uneasiness at first and a Prejudice to hear any thing Contrary to those *Principles* in which one has been Educated from his Infancy, and thinks most Certain. But this must be overcome so far as to hear *Reason*, which will Confirm us the more if we be in the *Truth*, or otherwise Convince us of our *Error*, at least make it so far Excusable, that we have not Refused the Reasonable Means of Information: Without this, no Man could have been a *Christian* at first, nor has been since but by Accident, according to the Place where he was Born, or received his *Education*. But the *Prophet* calls a due Examination of these things (*a*) a *shewing our selves to be Men*. And the *Apostles* gives it the Character of a *Nobleness*

(*a*) Isai. xlvi. 8.

Nobleness of Spirit in those who (*b*) *Searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.* And *therefore* (says he) *Many of them Believed*, of the *Honourable* both *Men* and *Women*. Whilst those *Bigotted* who Stuck to *Implicit Faith* in the *Church*, it is said, (*c*) *Believed not*, but were *Moved with Envy*, and Stirred up *Persecution* against those who Disturbed them in their *Security*, like Waking one out of his *Sleep*, though when it is done, he will Thank those who have Raised him from *Darkness* to *Light*, to *Seeing* with his own *Eyes*, instead of being Led by others *Implicitly* in the *Dark*, and Lulled into *Dreams* of *Security* from his *Blindness*, in which he is Persuaded ther is less Danger of *Stumbling*, than if his *Eyes* were open, because every Man's *Sight* is not Good, and has Deceived Many! Have I not taken a *Horse* for a *Man* at a Distance? And does not a *Stick* look *Crooked* in the *Water*? Why then should I trust my *Eyes* any more? This is all the *Reason* ever I could hear for not trusting to our *Reason*! And what is the Remedy proposed? If it were to give us Rules whereby to Judge of true *Reason*, to *Help* it, and to *Trim* this *Lamp* which *God* has *Lighted* for us, this would be *Rational*, like *Clearing* our *Eyes* if they were *Dim*: But the Remedy you propose, is, to Shut *Reason* quite out, to make no more Use of it, to *Silence*, to *Extinguish* it; and take *Implicit Faith* in its Room; like pulling out one's *Eyes*, because they are not Good; and Choose to be Led by

(*b*) Act. xvii. 11, 12. (*c*) Ver. 5.

by the Hand, and never Examine our Way any more? But I think the *Apostle* recommends *Examining* to us, and I will Conclude with his Advice,

Prove all things; and hold fast that which is Good. 1 Thess. v. 21.

Books *Decisive* and not *Answered.*

Dr. *Barrow* of the *Pope's Supremacy*, and the *Unity of the Church.* 1680.

Dr. *Cosin* (since Bishop of *Durham*) his *Scholastical History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture.* 1657.

This is concerning the *Apocryphal* Books.

His *History of Transubstantiation* (the *English* Translation) 1676. Writ in *Latin.* 1657.

The Devotions of the Roman Church 1674.

This is concerning the *Invocation* of *Saints*, of *Reliques*, and the *Legends.*

The incurable Scepticism of the Church of Rome. 1688.

This is concerning the *Rule* of *Faith.*

FINIS.

Ex Bullario Laertii Cherubini, Romæ 1638.

TOM. III. p. 183.

Constitutio Pauli V. 63.

EXcommunicatio & Anathematizatio quorumcunq; Hæreticorum, eorumq; fautorum ac Schismaticorum, vel Ecclesiasticam Libertatem lædentium, aut quoquo modo dispositis in hac Bulla, de more in die Cænæ Domini publicare solita contravenientium.

Quoad omnia quasi Capitula hujus Bullæ (ultra Extravagan. 3. *Pauli* II. & Extravagan. 5. *Sixti* IV. in tit. de Pænitentia & Remissi-

The Sixty third Constitution of *Paul* V.

THE Excommunication and Anathematization of all Hereticks whatsoever, and their favourers, and Schismaticks, or of those who violate the Ecclesiastical Liberty, or any ways infringe the Contents of this Bull, which is wont to be published on Maunday-Thursday.

As for almost all the Chapters of this Bull, (besides the 3d Extravagant of Paul II. *and the 5th Extravagant of* Sixtus IV. *in the Title of*

onibus)

onibus habes supra Constitut. 1 *Urbani* V. *fol.* 215. Constitut. 25. *Julii* II. *f.* 482. Constitut. 10. *Pauli* III. *f.* 522. necnon Constitut. 81. *Gregorii* XIII. *f.* 348. *l.* 2. Aliorum autem Bullas ejusmodi Cænæ Domini nuncupantes volens prætermisi, his duntaxat contentus, ex quibus pro temporum conditione Romanos Pontifices aliquid immutasse cognoscatur. Non tamen posthabui proxime indicandas, uti apprime necessarias, & super hujus Bullæ capitibus specialiter editas.

Extat ergo in hoc Opere specialis edita sanctio *Nicolai* III. circa § primum hujus Bullæ in ejus Const. 2. sup. *fol.* 143. & circa § 2. extat Const. 5. *Pii* II. *f.* 290 *l.* 1. Circa § 4. extat Const. 7. *Pii*

Penance and Remissions) *you have them before ordained in the first Constitution of* Urban V. f. 215. *in the* 25*th Const. of* Julius II. f. 482. *in the* 10*th Const. of* Paul III. f. 522. *and in the* 81*st. Const. of* Gregori XIII. f. 348. lib. 2. *Other Bulls if this nature, called Bulls* in Cænæ Domini, *I have purposely omitted, being content with these; from which it may appear that the Popes have made some Variation in them, according to the Exigency of the Times. Yet I would not omit those which follow, as being especially necessary, and particularly published upon the several Chapters of this Bull.*

There is extant therefore in this Collection, a particular Edict of Nicolas III. *about the* 1*st Section of this Bull in his* 2*d Constitution,* Sup. fol. 143. *concerning* Sect. 2. *there is extant Const.* 5. *of* Pius II. f. V.

V. *f.* 137. *l.* 2. Circa § 7. extat Conſt. 3. *Nicolai* V. *f.* 283. *l.* 1. Circa § 10 extat Canon *Calliſti.* l. in *c.* 23. cauſ. 24. *q.* 3. Circa § 11. reſpectu Cardinalium extat Conſt. 16. *Leonis* X. *f.* 420. *l.* 1 & alia 93. *Pii* V. *f.* 222. *l.* 2. Circa § 12. extat Conſt. 11. *Alexandri* VI. *f.* 352. Circa § 14. extat. Conſt. 2. *Martini* V. *f.* 239. & alia 17. *Innocentii* VIII. *f.* 343. ac altera 30. *Leonis* IX. *f.* 440 necnon alia 39. *Clementis* VII. *f.* 505. *l.* 1. & altera 19. *Gregorii* XIII. *f.* 290. *l.* 2 Circa § 15. multi ſunt Canones in Corpore Juris, & extat Conſt. 10. *Martini* V. *f.* 247. Circa § 19. extat Conſt. 3. *Urbani* VI. *f.* 222. Et Circa § 20 extat Conſt. 8. *Joannes* XXII. *f.* 174. & alia 3. *Clementis* VI. *f.* 212. alia 13. *Leonis*

290. l. 1. *concerning* § 4. *there is extant*, *Conſt.* 7. *of* Pius V. f. 137. l. 2. *concerning* § 7. *is extant*, *Conſt.* 3. *of* Nicolas V. f. 283. l. 1. *concerning* § 10. *is extant a* Canon *of* Caliſtus. *in c.* 23. *Conſt.* 24. *qu.* 3. *Concerning* § 11. *in reſpect of the Cardinals is extant Conſt.* 16. *of* Leo X. f. 420. l. 1. *and Conſt.* 93. *of* Pius V. f. 222. l. 2. *Concerning* § 12. *is extant Conſt.* 11. *of* Alexander VI. f. 352. *Concerning* § 14. *is extant Conſt.* 2. *of* Martin V. f. 293. *and Conſt.* 17. *of* Innocent VIII. f. 343. *and Conſt.* 30. *of* Leo X. f. 440. *and Conſt.* 39. *of* Clement VII. f. 505. l. 1. *and Conſt.* 19. *of* Gregory XIII. f. 290. l. 2. *Concerning* § 15. *are many Canons in the Body of the Law*, *and Conſt.* 10. *of* Martin V. f. 247.

X

X. f. 314. & altera 11 *Pauli* IV. f. 595.

Concerning § 19. *is extant Conſt.* 3. *of* Urban VI. f. 222. *Concerning* § 20. *is extant Conſt.* 8. *of* John XXII. f. 174. *and Conſt.* 3. *of* Clement VI. f. 212. *and Conſt.* 13. *of* Leo X. f. 314. *and Conſt.* 11. *of* Paul IV. f. 595.

Alia hujuſmodi Excommunicatio in die Cænæ Domini Promulgari ſolita eſt in S. D. N. *Urbani* VIII. Conſt. 62: Paſtoralis infr. Tom. 4.

Another like Excommunication uſually publiſhed on Maun-day Thurſday, *is extant in the* 62*d Conſtitution of our Holy Lord* Urban VIII. *inf. Tom.* 4.

Paulus Epiſcopus, Servus Servorum Dei, ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Paul Biſhop, Servant of the Servants of God, in perpetual memory of the thing now Decreed.

PAſtoralis *Romani* Pontificis vigilantia & ſollicitudo, cum in omni Reipublicæ Chriſtianæ pace & tranquillitate procuranda pro ſui muneris officio affidue verſatur, tum potiſſimum in Catholicæ

THE Paſtoral vigilance and care of the Biſhop of Rome, *being by the Duty of his Office continually employed in procuring by all means the Peace and tranquillity of Chriſtendom is more eſpecially eminent*

licæ fidei sine qua impossibile est placere Deo, unitate atq; integritate retinenda, maxime elucet: Nimirum ut fideles Christi non sint parvuli fluctuantes, neq; circumferanter omni vento doctrinæ in nequitia hominum ad circumventionem erroris, sed omnes occurrant in unitate fidei & agnitionis Filii Dei in virum perfectum, neq; se in hujus vitæ societate & communione lædant, aut inter se alter alteri offensionem præbeant, sed potius in vinculo charitatis conjuncti, tanquam unius corporis membra sub Christo capite, ejusq; in terris Vicario *Romano* Pontifice Beatissimi *Petri* Successore, a quo totius Ecclesia unitas dimanat, augeantur in ædificatione, atq; ita divina gratia adjutrice sic præsentis vitæ quiere gau-

in retaining and preserving the unity and integrity of Catholick Faith; without which it is impossible to please God? That so the faithful of Christ may not be as Children wavering, nor be carried about with every wind of Doctrine by the cunning craft of men, whereby they lay in wait to deceive; but that all may meet in the unity of the Faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man: That in the communion and society of this life they may not injure nor offend one another; but rather being joined together with the bond of Charity, as members of one body under Christ the Head, and his Vicar upon Earth the Bishop of Rome, *St.* Peter's *Successor, from whom the unity of the whole Church doth flow, may be increased in edification, and by the assistance of the Divine*

deant,

deant, ut futura quoque beatitudine perfruantur. Ob quas sane causas *Romani* Pontifices prædecessores nostri hodierna die, quæ anniversaria Dominicæ Cœnæ commemoratione solennis est, spiritualem Ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ gladium, et salutaria justitiæ arma per ministerium summi Apostolatus ad Dei gloriam et animarum salutem solenniter exercere consueverunt. Nos igitur, quibus nihil optabilius est, quam fidei inviolatam integritatem, publicam Pacem et Justitiam, Deo autore, tueri, vetustum et solennem hunc morem sequentes.

§ 1. Excommunicamus et anathematizamus ex parte Dei Omnipotentis, Patris & Filii et Spiritus Sancti, auctoritate quoque

Grace may so enjoy the tranquility of this present life, that they may also attain eternal happiness. For which Reasons the Bishops of Rome, *our Predecessors, upon this day which is dedicated to the Aniversary commemoration of our Lord's Supper, have been wont sollemnly to exercise the Spiritual Sword of Ecclesiastical Discipline and wholsome Weapons of Justice by the Ministry of the Supreme Apostolate to the glory of God and salvation of Souls. We therefore, desiring nothing more than by the guidance of God to preserve inviolable the integrity of Faith, publick Peace and Justice; following this ancient and solemn Custom.*

§. 1. *We excommunicate and anathematize in the name of God Almighty, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and by the authority of the Blessed Apo-*

Beatorum

Beatorum Apostolorum *Petri* et *Pauli*, ac nostra, quoscunq; Hussitas, Vuichlephistas, Luterannos, Zainglianos, Calvinistas, Ugonottos, Anabaptistas, Trinitarios, et a Christiana fide Apostatas, ac omnes et singulos alias Hæreticos, quocunque nomine censeantur, et cujuscunque sectæ existant; ac eis credentes, eorumque receptatores, fautores, et generaliter quoslibet illorum defensores; ac eorundem libros hæresin continentes, vel de Religione tractantes sine auctoritate nostra et Sedis Apostolicæ scienter legentes aut retinentes, imprimentes, seu quomodolibet defendentes, ex quavis causa publice vel occulte, quovis ingenio vel colore; necnon Schismaticos, et eos qui se a nostra et *Romani*

sies, Peter and Paul, and by our own, all Hussites, Wiclephists, Lutherans, Zainglians, Calvinists, Hugonots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and Apostates from the Christian Faith, and all other Hereticks by whatsoever name they are called, and of whatsoever Sect they be: As also their adherents, Receivers, Favourers, and generally any Defenders of them; together with all who without our Authority, or that of the Apostolick See, knowingly read, keep, print, or any ways for any cause whatsoever publickly or privately on any pretext or colour, defend their Books containing Heresie, or treating of Religion; as also Schismaticks, and those who withdraw themselves, or recede obstinately from the obedience of us, or the Bishop of Rome *for the time being.*

Pontificis pro tempore existentis obedientia pertinaciter subtrahunt vel recedunt.

§ 2. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes & singulos, cujuscunq; status, gradus, seu conditionis fuerint Universitates Collegia & Capitula, quocunque nomine nuncupentur, interdicimus, ab ordinationibus seu mandatis nostris ac *Romanorum* Pontificum pro tempore existentium ad Universale futurum Concilium appellantes; necnon eos quorum auxilio vel favore appellatum fuerit.

§ 3. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes Piratas, Cursarios ac Latrunculos Maritimos, discurrentes Mare nostrum, præcipue a Monte *Argentario* usque ad *Terracinam*, ac omnes eorum fautores,

§ 2. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all and singular, of whatsoever station, degree or condition they be; and interdict all Universities, Colleges and Chapters, by whatsoever name they are called; who appeal from the Orders or Decrees of Us, or the Popes of* Rome *for the time being to a future General Council; and those by whose aid and favour the Appeal was made.*

§ 3. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all Pirates, Corsairs and Robbers by Sea, roving about our Sea chiefly from Mount* Argentiere *to* Terracina, *and all their Abetters, Receivers and Defenders.*

receptatores

receptatores & defensores.

§ 4. Item Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes & singulos, qui Christianorum quorumcunq; navibus tempestate, seu in transversum (ut dici solet) jactatis, vel quoquo modo naufragium passis, seu in ipsis navibus, sive ex eisdem ejecta in mare, vel in littore inventa, cujuscunq; generis bona, tam in nostris, *Tyrrheni* & *Adriatici*, quam in cæteris cujusque Maris regionibus & littoribus, surripuerint; ita ut nec ob quodcunque Privilegium, Consuetudinem, aut longissimi etiam immemorabilis temporis possessionem, seu alium quemcunque prætextum excusari possint.

§ 4. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all and singular, who when the Ships of any Christians are either driven out of the way by Tempest, or any ways suffer shipwrack, convey away any Goods of what kind soever, either in the Shipe themselves, or cast out of the Ships into the Sea, or found on the Shore, as well in our* Tyrrhenian *and* Adriatick *Seas, as in any other Divisions of Shores of all Seas whatsoever; so that they shall not be excused by any Privilege, Custom, or possession of time immemorial or any other pretext whatsoever.*

§ 5. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes qui in terris suis nova Pe-

§ 5. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all who impose or augment any new Tolls or*

 dagia

dagia seu Gabellas, præterquam in casibus sibi a jure, seu ex speciali sedis Apostolicæ licentia permissis, imponunt vel augent, seu imponi vel augeri prohibita exigunt.

§ 6. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes falsarios literarum Apostolicarum, etiam in forma Brevis, ac Supplicationum, Gratiam vel Justitiam concernentium, per *Romanum* Pontificem, vel *S. R. E.* Vicecancellarios seu gerentes vices eorum, aut de mandato ejusdem Pontificis signatarum, necnon falso publicantes literas Apostolicas, etiam in forma Brevis, & etiam falso signantes Supplicationes hujusmodi sub nomine *Romani* Pontificis seu Vicecancellarii, aut gerentium vices prædictorum.

Gabells in their Dominions, except in cases permitted to them by Law, or by especial leave of the Apostolick See; or, who exact such Taxes forbidden to be imposed or augmented.

§ 6. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all Forgers of Apostolick Letters, even in form of a Brief, and of Supplications respecting Indulgence or Justice, signed by the Pope of* Rome, *or by the Vice-chancellors of the Holy See of* Rome, *or by their Deputies, or by the command of the said Pope; as also those who falsly publish the Apostolick Letters, even in form of a Brief; and those who falsly sign such Supplications in the name of the Pope of* Rome, *or the Vice-chancellor, or their Deputies.*

§

§ 7. Item Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes illos, qui ad *Saracenos*, *Turcas*, & alios Christiani nominis hostes, & inimicos, vel Hæreticos per nostras vel hujus Sanctæ Sedis sententias expresse vel nominatim declaratos deferunt seu transmittunt Equos, Arma, Ferrum, filum Ferri, Stannum, Chalybem, omniaque Metallorum genera atque Bellica Instrumenta, Lignamina, Canapem, Funes, tam ex ipso Canape quam alia quacunque materia, & ipsam materiam, aliaque hujusmodi, quibus Christianos & Catholicos impugnant; nec non illos qui per se vel per alios de rebus statum Christianæ Reipublicæ concernentibus, in *Christianorum* perniciem & damnum ipsos *Turcas* & Christianæ Religionis inimicos, necnon

§ 7. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all those, who carry or transmit to the* Saracens, Turks, *and other Enemies and Foes of the Christian Religion, or to those who are expresly and by name declared Hereticks by the Sentence of us, or of this Holy See, Horses, Arms, Iron, Wire of Iron, Tin, Steel, and all kind of Metals, and Warlike Instruments, Timber, Hemp, Ropes made as well of Hemp as of any other matter, or that matter whatsoever it be, and other things of this nature, which they make use of to the prejudice of Christians and Catholicks: As also those who by themselves or others give intelligence of matters relating to the State of Christendom to the* Turks *and Enemies of the Christian Religion to the hurt and prejudice of Christians, or to Hereticks to the Prejudice of*

 Hæreticos,

Hæreticos, in damnum Catholicæ Religionis, certiores faciunt, illisque ad id auxilium, consilium, vel favorem quomodo libet præstant. Non obstantibus quibuscunq; Privilegiis, quibusvis Personis, Principibus, Rebuspublicis per nos & Sedem prædictam hactenus concessis, de hujusmodi prohibitione expressam mentionem non facientibus.

the Catholick Religion, or who any ways afford to them counsel, assistance or favour; notwithstanding any Privileges hitherto granted by Us and the aforesaid See to any Persons, Princes or Common-wealths; wherein express mention is not made of this prohibition.

§. 8. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes impedientes seu invadentes eos, qui victualia seu alia ad usum *Romanæ* Curiæ necessaria adducunt, ac etiam eos qui ne ad *Romanum* Curiam adducantur vel afferantur prohibent, impediunt seu perturbant, seu hæc facientes defendunt per se vel per alios, cujuscunque fuerint ordinis, præminenti, conditio-

§. 8. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all hindering or invading those, who bring Provisions, or any other things necessary, for the use of the Court of* Rome; *as also those who forbid, hinder or obstruct the bringing or conducting of them to the Court of* Rome; *or who abet the doers of these things either by themselves, or by others; of whatsoever order pre-eminence, condition or quality they be,*

nis

nis & status, etiamsi Pontificali seu Regali aut alia quavis Ecclesiastica vel mundana præfulgeant dignitate.

even although they be Bishops or Kings, or invested with any other Ecclesiastical or Secular Dignity.

§. 9. Item Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes illos, qui ad sedem Apostolicam venientes, & recedentes ab eadem, sua vel aliorum opera interficiunt, mutilant, spoliant, capiunt, detinent; necnon illos omnes qui jurisdictionem ordinariam vel delegatam a nobis vel nostris Judicibus non habentes, illam sibi temere vendicantes similia contra morantes in eadem Curia audent perpetrare.

§ 9. *Farther, We excommunicate and anathematize all those, who kill, maim, spoil, apprehend or detain by themselves, or by others, those who come to the Apostolick See, or return from it; as also all those who having no ordinary jurisdiction, nor any deligated by Us or our Judges, rashly challenging it to themselves, presume to commit any like Actions against those who reside at the Court of* Rome.

§. 10. Item Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes interficientes, mutilantes, vulnerantes, detinentes, capientes seu deprædantes Romipe-

§. 10. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all who kill, maim, wound, detain, apprehend, or rob Travellers to* Rome; *or Pilgrims for the sake of*

tas seu Perigrinos ad Urbem causa Devotionis accedentes, et in ea moramtes, vel ab ipsa recedentes, et in his dantes auxilium, consilium, vel favorem.

Devotion or Pilgrimage going to that City, staying in it, or returning from it; and those who give aid, counsel or favour in these cases.

§ 11. Item, Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes interficientes, vulnerantes, mutilantes, percutientes, capientes, carcerantes, detinentes, vel hostiliter insequentes S. R. E. Cardinales, ac Patriarchas, Archiepiscopos, Episcopos, Sedisq; Apostolica Legatos vel nuncios, aut eos a suis Diœcesibus, Territoriis, Terris seu Dominiis ejicientes, necnon ea mandantes vel rata habentes, seu præstantes in eis auxilium, consilium, vel favorem.

§ 11. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all who slay, wound, maim, strike, apprehend, imprison, detain, or in hostile manner pursue the Cardinals of the Holy Church of Rome, and Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Legats, or Nuncios of the Apostolick See; or those who drive them out of their Territories, Diocesses, Lands or Dominions; or those who command or allow these things to be done, or give aid, counsel and favour to them.*

§ 12. Item, Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes illos, qui per se vel per alios,

§ 12. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all those, who by themselves or by others*

personas

personas Ecclesiasticas quascunque, vel seculares ad *Romanam* Curiam super eorum causis et negotiis recurrentes, ac illa in eadem Curia prosequentes aut procurantes negotiorumque gestores, advocatos, procuratores et agentes, seu etiam Auditores vel Judices super dictis causis vel negotiis deputatos, occasione causarum vel negotiorum hujusmodi occidunt seu quoquo modo percutiunt, bonis spoliant; seu qui per se vel per alios, directe vel indirecte delicta hujusmodi committere exequi vel procurare, aut in eisdem auxilium, consilium vel favorem præstare non verentur, cujuscunque præeminentiæ et dignitatis fuerint.

slay or any ways strike or despoil any Ecclesiastical or Secular Persons having recourse to the Court of Rome *for their Causes and Affairs, and prosecuting and managing them in the said Court, or even the Auditors or Judges deputed for the hearing and managing of the said Causes and Affairs, upon occasion of these Causes and Affairs; as also those who by themselves or by others directly or indirectly presume to act or procure the said Crimes, or to give aid, counsel or favour to them, of whatsoever preheminence or dignity they be.*

§. 13. Item Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes tam Ecclesiasticos quam Seculares, cujuscunque dignitatis,

§. 13. *Further We excommunicate and anathematize all those as well Ecclesiasticks as Seculars, of whatsoever dig-*

dignitatis, qui prætexentes frivolam quandam appellationem a gravamine vel futura executione literarum Apostolicarum etiam in forma Brevis, tam gratiam quam justitiam concernentium, necnon citationum, inhibitionum, sequestrationum, monitoriorum, processuum, executorialium, & aliorum Decretorum, a Nobis & Sede prædicta seu Legatis, Nunciis, Præsidentibus, Palatii nostri & Cameræ Apostolicæ Auditoribus, Commissariis, aliisque Judicibus & delegatis Apostolicis emanatorum, & quæ pro tempore emanaverint, aut alias ad Curias Sæculares & Laicam potestatem recurrent, & ab ea instante etiam Fisci Procuratore & Advocato, appellationes hujusmodi admitti, ac lites, citationes, in-

nity they be, who under pretence of a certain frivolous appeal from the injustice or future execution of the Apostolick Letters, even in form of a Brieve, respecting as well indulgence as justice, as also from the injustice, and future execution of Citations, Inhibitions, Sequestrations, Monitories, Processes, Executorials and other Degrees, issuing out, or which shall at any time issue out from Us and the aforesaid See, or our Legates, Nuncios, or Presidents, from the Auditors of our Palace and Apostolick Chamber, from our Commissaries, and other Apostolick Judges and Delegates: as also those, who any other ways have recourse to Secular Courts and the Lay Power; and who cause such Appeals to be admitted by the Secular Court, even although the Procurator and Advocate of the Exchequer

hibitiones,

hibitiones, sequestra, monitoria, & alia prædicta, capi & retineri faciunt. Quive illa simplicitur, vel sine eorum beneplacito & consensu vel examine executione, demandari, aut ne Tabelliones & Notarii super hujusmodi literarum & processuum executione, instrumenta vel acta conficere, aut confecta parti cujus interest, tradere debeant, impediunt vel prohibent, ac etiam partes seu eorum agentes, consanguineos, affines, familiares, notarios, executores & sub-executores literarum, citationum, monitoriorum, & aliorum prædictorum capiunt, percutiunt, vulnerant, carcerant, detinent, ex Civitatibus, Locis, & Regnis ejiciunt, bonis spoliant, perterrefaciunt, concutiunt & comminantur per se vel per alium seu alios,

should require it; or who cause the aforesaid Letters, Citations, Inhibitions, Sequestrations, Monitories, &c. to be seized or retained; or those who hinder or forbid the said Letters to be put in execution, either simply or without their good will, consent or examination; or who hinder or forbid Scriveners or Notaries from making or delivering when made to the Parties concerned any Instruments or Acts concerning the Execution of these Letters and Processes; or who apprehend, strike, wound, imprison, detain; drive out of Cities, Places and Kingdoms, despoil of their Goods, terrify, vex, and threaten either by themselves, or by others, publickly or privately, the Parties or their Agents, Kindred on both sides, their Friends, Notaries, the Executors or Sub-executors of the said

public

publice vel occulte; quive alias quibuscunque personis in genere vel in specie, ne pro quibusvis eorum negotiis prosequendis seu gratiis vel literis impetrandis ad *Romanam* Curiam accedant, aut recursum habeant, seu gratias ipsas vel literas a dicta Sede impetrent seu impetratis utantur, directe vel indirecte prohibere, statuere seu mandare, vel eas apud se aut notarios seu Tabelliones, vel alias quomodolibet retinere præsumunt.

§ 14. Item excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes & singulos, qui per se vel alios auctoritate propria ac de facto, quarumcunq; exemptionum vel aliarum gratiarum & literarum Apostolicarum prætextu, beneficiales, & decimarum, ac alias

Letters, Citations, Monitories, &c. or who any other way presume directly or indirectly to forbid, ordain and command, any Persons in general or in particular, to betake themselves, or have recourse to the See of Rome *to prosecute their Affairs of any kind, or to obtain Indulgences or Letters, or who forbid them to obtain the said Indulgences, or to make use of them when obtained of the said See; or who presume to retain the said Indulgences in their own hands, or in the hands of a Notary or a Scrivener or any other way.*

§ 14. *Further, We Excommunicate and Anathematize all and singular, who by themselves or by others, by their own Authority and* de facto, *under pretence of any exemptions, or any other Apostolick Indulgences and Letters, take away the cognizance of Benefices and Tithes, and other*

causas

causas spirituales ac spiritualibus annexas, ab Auditoribus & Commissariis nostris, aliisq; Judicibus Ecclesiasticis avocant; illarumve cursum & audientiam; ac personas, capitula, Conventus, Collegia, causas ipsas prosequi volentes impediunt ac se de illarum cognitione tanquam Judices interponunt. Quive partes actrices, quæ illas committi fecerunt, & faciunt ad revocandum & revocari faciendum citationes vel inhibitiones aut alias literas in eis decretas, & ad faciendum vel consentiendum eos contra quos tales inhibitiones emanarunt a censuris et pænis in illis contentis absolvi, per statutum vel alias compellunt; vel executionem literarum Apostolicarum seu executorialium, processuum ac

spiritual Causes, or annexed to spiritualis from our Auditors and Commissaries, and other Ecclesiastical Judges; and hinder the proceeding and audience of them, and the Persons, Chapters, Convents, Colleges, desiring to prosecute the said Causes; or who intrude themselves as Judges in the Cognizance of them; or who by order, or any other way compel the Plaintiffs to withdraw, or cause to be withdrawn, their Citations, or Inhibitions, or any other Letters decreed in the spiritual Court; and the Defendants against whom such Inhibitions were issued out, to procure, or consent to be absolved from the Censures or Punishments contained in them; or who any way hinder the execution of Apostolick Letters, Executorials, Processes and Decrees aforesaid; or give their allowance, council,

De-

decretorum prædictorum quomodolibet impediunt, vel suum ad id favorem, consilium aut assensum præstans, etiam prætextu violentiæ prohibendæ, vel aliarum prætensionum, seu etiam, donec ipsi ad nos informandos, ut dicunt, supplicaverint aut supplicari fecerint; nisi supplicationes hujusmodi coram Nobis & sede Apostolica legitime prosequantur, etiamsi talia committentes fuerint, Præsidentes Cancellariarum, Consiliorum, Parlamentorum, Cancellarii, Vicecancellarii, Consiliarii, ordinarii vell extraordinarii quorumcunq; Principum Sæcularium; etiamsi Imperiali, Regali, Ducali, vel alia quacunq; præfulgeant dignitate; aut Archiepiscopi, Episcopi, Abbates Commendatarii seu Vicarii fuerint.

or assent to it, even under pretence of hindring violence, or any other pretexts whatsoever, or even until they shall Petition us, or cause us to be Petitioned for our better information, as is commonly pretended, unless they prosecute such Petitions before us and the Apostolick See in lawful form; even although those who commit such things should be Presidents of Chanceries, Councils, or Parliaments, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, ordinary or extraordinary Councellors of any secular Princes (whether they be Emperors, Kings, Dukes, or any other dignity) or Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Commendataries or Vicars.

§

§ 15. Quive ex eorum pretenso officio, vel ad instantiam partis, aut aliorum quorumcunq; personas Ecclesiasticas, Capitula, Conventus, Collegia Ecclesiarum quarumcunq; coram se ad suum Tribunal, Audientiam, Cancellariam, Concilium, vel Parlamentum, præter juris Canonici dispositionem, trahunt, vel trahi faciunt vel procurant, directe vel indirecte, quovis quæsito colore; necnon qui statuta, ordinationes, constitutiones, pragmaticas, seu quævis alia decreta in genere vel in specie, ex quavis causa & quovis quæsito colore, ac etiam prætextu cujusvis consuetudinis & privilegii, vel alias quomodolibet fecerint, ordinaverint & publicaverint, vel factis & ordinatis usi fuerint, unde libertates Ecclesia-

§ 15. *Also those who under pretence of their Office, or at the instance of any party, or of any others, draw, or cause and procure to be drawn, directly, or indirectly, upon any pretext whatsoever, Ecclesiastical Persons, Chapters, Convents, Colleges of any Churches, before them to their Tribunal, Audience, Chancery, Counsel, or Parliament, against the Rules of the Canon-Law; as also those who for any cause, or under any pretext, or by pretence of any Custom or Privilege, or any other way, shall make, enact, and publish any Statutes, Orders, Constitutions, Pragmaticks, or any other Degrees in general or in particular; or shall use them when made and enacted; whereby the Ecclesiastical Liberty is violated, or any ways injured or depressed; or by any other means restrained; or whereby the Rights of us and of the*

stica

stica tollitur, seu in aliquo læditur vel deprimitur, aut alio quovis modo restringitur, seu nostris & dictæ sedis, ac quarumcunq; ecclesiarum juribus quomodolibet directe vel indirecte, tacite vel expresse præjudicantur.

said See, and of any other Churches, are any way directly or indirectly, tacitely or expressly prejudged.

§ 16. Necnon qui Archiepiscopos, Episcopos, aliosq; superiores & inferiores Prælatos, & omnes alios quoscunq; Judices Ecclesiasticos ordinarios quomodolibet hac de causa directe vel indirecte, carcerando vel molestando eorum agentes, procuratores, familiares, necnon consanguineos & affines, aut alias impediunt, quo minus jurisdictione sua Ecclesiastica contra quoscunque utantur, secundum quod Canones & sacræ constitutiones Ecclesiasticæ, & decreta Conciliorum Generalium, & præsertim

§. 16. *Also those who upon this account directly or indirectly hinder Archbishops, Bishops, and other superior and inferior Prelates, and all other ordinary Ecclesiastical Judges whatsoever by any means, either by imprisoning or molesting their Agents, Proctors, Domesticks, kindred on both sides, or by any other way from exerting their Ecclesiastical jurisdiction against any persons whatsoever, according as the Canons and sacred Ecclesiastical Constitutions and Decrees of General Councils, and especially that of* Trent, *do appoint; as also those who*

præsertim Tridentini, statuunt; ac etiam eos qui post ipsorum ordinariorum ac etiam ab eis delegatorum quorumcunq; sententias et decreta, aut alias fori ecclesiastici judicium eludentes, ad Cancellarias et alias Curias seculares recurrunt, et ab illis prohibitiones et mandata etiam pœnalia, ordinariis aut delegatis prædictis decerni, et contra illos exequi procurant; eos quoq; qui hæc decernunt et exequuntur, seu dant auxilium, concilium, patrocinium & favorem in eisdem.

§. 17. Quive jurisdictiones seu fructus, reditus & proventus ad nos & sedem Apostolicam, & quascunque Ecclesiasticas personas ratione Ecclesiarum, Monasteriorum & aliorum beneficiorum Ecclesiasticorum pertinentes usurpant,

after the sentence and decrees of the Ordinaries themselves, or of those delegated by them, or by any other means eluding the judgment of the Ecclesiastical Court, have recourse to Chancerie or other secular Courts, and procure thence Prohibitions and even Penal Mandates to be decreed against the said Ordinaries and Delegates and executed against them; also those who make and execute these Decrees, or who give aid, counsel, countenance or favour to them.

§ 17. *Also those who usurp any Jurisdictions, Fruits, Revenues, and Emoluments belonging to Us and the Apostolick See, and any Ecclesiastical persons upon account of any Churches, Monasteries, or other Ecclesiastical benefices; or who upon any occasion or cause seque-*

vel

vel etiam quavis occasione vel causa sine Romani Pontificis vel aliorum ad id legitimam facultatem habentium expressa licentia sequestrant.

§ 18. Quive collectas, decimas, talleas, præstantias & alia onera Clericis, Prælatis & aliis personis Ecclesiasticis, ac eorum & Ecclesiarum, Monasteriorum & aliorum beneficiorum Ecclesiasticorum bonis, illorumve fructibus, reditibus & proventibus hujusmodi, absque simili Romani Pontificis speciali & expressa licentia imponunt, & diversis etiam exquisitis modis exigunt, aut sic imposita a sponte dantibus & concedentibus recipiunt. Necnon qui per se vel alios directe vel indirecte prædicta facere, exequi vel procurare, aut in eisdem auxilium, consilium vel favorem præstare non verentur, cu-

ster the said Revenues without the express leave of the Bishop of Rome, *or others having lawful power to do it.*

§ 18. *Also those who without the like special and express licence of the Pope of* Rome *impose Tributes, Tenths, Talleys, Subsidies, and other Charges upon Clergy-men, Prelates, and other Ecclesiastical Persons, and the Goods, Fruits, Revenues and Emoluments of them and of the Churches, Monasteries, and other Ecclesiastical Benefices; and exact them by divers artifices, or even receive them so imposed from the Clergy, although they should of their own accord grant and give them: Also those who by themselves or others directly or indirectly fear not to do, execute or procure the said things, or to give aid, counsel or favour to them, of whatsoever preheminence, dignity, order,*

juscunq;

-juscunq; sint præeminentiæ, dignitatis, ordinis, conditionis aut status, etiamsi Imperiali aut Regali fulgeant dignitate; seu Principes, Duces, Comites, Barones, et alii Potentatus; quicunq; etiam Regnis, Provinciis, Civitatibus & Terris quoquomodo Præsidentes, consiliarii & Senatores, aut quavis etiam Pontificali dignitate insigniti. Innovantes decreta, super his per Sacros Canones, tam in *Lateranensi* novissime celebrato, quam aliis Conciliis generalibus edita, etiam cum censuris & pœnis in eis contentis.

condition or quality they be, although they be Emperors, or Kings, or Princes, Dukes, Earls, Barons, and other Potentates whatsoever, even Presidents of Kingdoms, Provinces, Cities and Territories, Counsellers, and Senators, or invested even with any Pontifical Dignity. Renewing the Decrees set forth concerning these Matters by the Sacred Canons, as well in the last Council of Lateran, *as in other General Councils, together with the Censures and Punishments contained in them.*

§. 19. Item, Excommunicamus & anathematizamus omnes & quoscunq; Magistratus & Judices, Notarios, Scribas, Executores, Subexecutores quomodolibet se interponentes in causis capitalibus seu criminalibus contra

§ 19. *Further, We excommunicate and anathematize all and every Magistrates and Judges, Notaries, Scribas, Executors, Subexecutors, any ways intruding themselves in capital or criminal causes against Ecclesiastical Persons by processing,*

Personas Ecclesiasticas, illas processando, banniendo, seu sententias contra illas proferendo vel exequendo sine speciali, specifica & expressa hujus Sanctæ Sedis Apostolicæ Licentia; quique ejusmodi licentiam ad Personas & casus non expressos extendunt, vel alias illa perperam abutuntur, etiamsi talia committentes fuerint Consiliarii, Senatores, Præsidentes, Cancellarii, Vicecancellarii, aut quovis alio nomine nuncupati.

banishing, or apprehending them, or pronouncing or executing any sentences against them, without the special, particular and express Licence of this Holy Apostolical See; also those who extend such Licences to Persons or Cases not expressed, or any other way injustly abuse them; altho' the Offender should be Counsellors, Senators, Presidents, Chancellors, Vice-Chancellors, or intitled by any other name.

§. 20. Item, Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes illos, qui per se seu alios, directe vel indirecte, sub quocunq; titulo seu colore invadere, destruere, occupare et detinere præsumpserint, in totum vel in partem Almam Urbem, Regnum *Siciliæ*, Insulas *Sardiniæ* et *Corsicæ*, Terras circa *Pharum*, Patrimonium

§ 20. *Farther, We excommunicate and anathematize all those, who by themselves, or by others, directly or indirectly, under any Title or Colour whatsoever shall presume to invade, destroy, seize, and detain, in whole or in part, the City of* Rome, *the Kingdom of* Sicily, *the Islands of* Sardinia *and* Corsica, *the Territories about* Faro, *St.* Peter's

B. *Petri* in *Tuscia*, Ducatum *Spoletanum*, Comitatum *Venaysinum*, *Sabinensem*, *Marchiæ*, *Anconitanæ*, *Massæ*, *Trebariæ*, *Romandiolæ*, *Campaniæ*, & Maritimas Provincias, illarumque Terras & loca, ac Terras specialis commissionis *Arnulforum*, Civitatesq; nostras *Bononiam*, *Cæsenam*, *Ariminum*, *Beneventum*, *Perusium*, *Avenionem*, Civitatem *Castelli*, *Tuderium*, *Ferrarium*, *Comaclum*, & alias Civitates, Terras, & loca, vel jura ad ipsam *Romanam* Ecclesiam pertinentia, dictæque *Romanæ* Ecclesiæ mediate vel immediate subjecta, necnon supremam jurisdictionem in illis, Nobis & eidem *Romanæ* Ecclesiæ competentem, de facto usurpare, perturbare, retinere & vexare variis modis præsumunt, nec non adhærentes, fautores, et defensores eorum,

Patrimony in Tuscany, *the Dukedom of* Spoleto, *the County of* Venosa, *and* Sabinum, Marca di Ancona, Massa, Trebaria, Romandiola, Campania, *and the Maritime Provinces, and their Territories and Places, and the Lands held in special commission by the* Arnulfi, *and our Cities of* Bononia, Cæsena, Arminum, Beneventum, Perusium, Avignon, Citta di Castello, Todi, Ferrara, Comaclo, *and other Cities, Lands and Places and Rights belonging to the Church of* Rome, *and subjected mediately or immediately to the said Church of* Rome; *also those who presume by divers means to usurp, disturb, detain, and vex the supreme Jurisdiction to the said Dominions belonging to Us and the Church of* Rome; *also their Adherents, Favour-*

rum, seu illis auxilium consilium, vel favorem quomodolibet præstantes.

§ 21. Volentes præsentes nostros Processus; ac omnia et quæcunq; his literis contenta, quousque alii hujusmodi processus a Nobis aut *Romano* Pontifice pro tempore existente fiant aut publicentur, durare, suosq; effectus omnino sortiri.

§ 22. Cæterum a prædictis sententiis nullus per alium quam per *Romanum* Pontificem, nisi in mortis articulo constitutus, nec etiam tunc, nisi de stando Ecclesiæ mandatis et satisfaciendo cautione præstita, absolvi possit, etiam prætextu quarumvis facultatum et indultorum quibuscunque personis Ecclesiasticis, secularibus, et quorumvis Ordinum, etiam Mendicantium et Militarium, regularibus,

ers and Defenders, or those who any way give assistance, counsel or favour to them.

§ 21 *Willing that our present processes, and all and every thing contained in these Letters, continue in force, and be put in execution; till other Processes of this kind be made and published by Us and the Pope of* Rome *for the time being.*

§ 22. *In fine, none may be absolved from the aforesaid Censures by any other than by the Pope of* Rome, *unless he be at the point of death, nor even then, unless he giveth caution to stand to the commands of the Church, and give satisfaction. In all other cases none shall be absolved, not even under pretence of any Faculties or Indulgences granted and renewed by Us and the said See, and the Decrees of any Council, by Words, Letters, or any*

etiam

etiam Episcopali vel alia majori dignitate præditis, ipsisque ordinibus & eorum Monasteriis, Conventibus, & Domibus ac Capitulis, Collegiis, Confraternitatibus, Congregationibus, Hospitalibus, et locis piis, necnon Laicis, etiamsi Imperiali, Regali, et alia, mundana excellentia fulgentibus, per Nos et dictam Sedem ac cujusvis Concilii decreta, verbo, literis, aut alia quacunque Scriptura in genere et in specie concessorum et innovatorum, ac concedendorum et innovandorum.

other Writing, in general or in particular, to any Persons Ecclesiastical, Secular, and Regular of any Orders, even of the Mendicant and Military Orders, or to any Persons invested with Episcopal, or any greater Dignity, and to Orders themselves and their Monasteries, Convents, Houses and Chapters, to Colleges, Confraternities, Congregations, Hospitals, and Pious Places, as also to Laymen, although they should be Emperors, Kings, or eminent in any other secular Dignity.

§ 23. Quod si forte aliqui contra tenorem præsentium talibus excommunicatione et anathemate laqueatis, vel illorum alicui absolutionis beneficium impendere de facto præsumpserint, eos excommunicationis sententia innodamus, gravius

§ 23. *If by chance any shall against the tenor of these Presents,* de facto, *presume to bestow the benefit of Absolution upon any such involved in excommunication, and anathema, or any of them; we include them in the Sentence of Excommunication, and*

 contra

contra eos spiritualiter et temporaliter, prout expedire noverimus processuri.

§ 24. Declarantes ac protestantes quamcunque absolutionem, etiamsi solennitur per Nos faciendam, prædictos excommunicatos sub præsentibus comprehensos, nisi prius a præmissis cum vero proposito similia ulterius non committendi, destiterint, ac quoad eos, qui contra ecclesiasticam libertatem, ut præmittitur, statuta fecerint, nisi prius statuta, ordinationes, constitutiones, pragmaticas, et decreta hujusmodi publice revocaverint, et ex Archivis seu Capitularibus, locis aut libris, in quibus annotata reperiuntur, deleri et cassari, ac Nos de revocatione hujusmodi certiores fecerint, eos non compre-

shall afterwards proceed more severely against them both by spiritual and temporal Punishments, as we shall think most convenient.

§ 24. *Declaring and protesting that no Absolution, altho' solemnly made by Us, shall comprehend, or any other way avail the aforesaid excommunicated Persons comprehended under these present Letters; unless they desist from the premisses with a firm purpose of never committing the like thing; nor those, who, as was before said, have made Statutes against the Ecclesiastical Liberty; unless they first publickly revoke these Statutes, Orders, Constitutions, Pragmaticks and Decrees, and cause them to be blotted and expunged out of the Archieves, Rolls, and Registers wherein they are preserved, and farther certify Us of this revocation: moreover, that by any such Absolution, or*

hendere

hendere, nec eis aliter suffragari; quinetiam per hujusmodi absolutionem, aut quoscunque alios actus contrarios tacitos vel expressos, ac etiam per patientiam et tolerantiam nostram vel Successorum nostrorum, quantocunq; tempore continuatam, præmissis omnibus et singulis, ac quibuscunque juribus Sedis Apostolicæ ac Sanctæ *Romanæ* Ecclesiæ undecunq; et quandocunq; quæsitis, vel quærendis nullatenus præjudicari posse aut debere.

any other contrary Acts, tacite or express, or even by the connivance and toleration of Us and our Successors for how long time soever continued, none nor any of the Premisses, nor any Right of the Apostolick See and Holy Church of Rome *howsoever and whensoever obtained, or to be obtained, can or ought to be prejudged or receive any prejudice.*

§ 25. Non obstantibus privilegiis, indulgentiis, indultis, et literis Apostolicis generalibus vel specialibus supradictis vel eorum, alicui, seu aliquibus aliis cujuscunq; ordinis, status vel conditionis, dignitatis et præeminentiæ fuerint, etiamsi, ut præmittitur, Pontificali, Imperiali, Regali,

§ 25. *Notwithstanding any Privileges, Indulgences, Grants, and Apostolick Letters general or special, granted by the Holy See to any of the aforesaid Persons, or any one of them, or any others, of whatsoever order, quality or condition, dignity, and preheminence they be; although, as was before said, they should be Bisho-*

ſi, ſeu quavis Eccleſiaſtica et mundana præfulgeant dignitate, vel eorum Regnis, Provinciis, civitatibus ſeu locis a prædicta Sede ex quavis cauſa etiam per viam contractus aut remunerationis, et ſub quavis alia forma et tenore, ac cum quibuſvis clauſulis, etiam derogatoriarum derogatoriis conceſſis, etiam continentibus quod excommunicari, anathematizari vel interdici non poſſint, per literas Apoſtolicas non facientes plenam et expreſſam ac de verbo ad verbum de indulto hujuſmodi, ac de ordinibus, locis nominibus propriis, cognominibus et dignitatibus eorum mentionem necnon conſuetudinibus, etiam immemorabilibus, ac præſcriptionibus quantumcunq; longiſſimis, et aliis quibuſlibet obſervantiis ſcriptis vel

ops, Emperors, Kings, eminent in any other Eccleſiaſtick or Secular Dignity, or to their Kingdoms, Provinces, Cities, and Dominions, for any cauſe whatſoever, even by way of contract or reward, and under any other form and tenor, and with any Clauſes whatſoever, even derogatory of thoſe which ſhould derogate from them, or even containing that the ſaid Perſons or Places ſhall not be excommunicated, anathematized or interdicted by any Apoſtolick Letters, which do not make full and expreſs mention and exact repetition of the ſaid Grant, and of the Orders, Places, Proper names, Sirnames and Dignities of the ſaid Perſons: as alſo notwithſtanding all Cuſtoms, even immemorial, and preſcriptions how long ſoever, and any other Obſervances written or not written, by which the ſaid Per-

non

non scriptis, per quæ contra hos nostros Processus ac sententias, quo minus includantur in eis, se juvare valeant ac tueri. Quæ omnia quoad hoc, eorum omnium tenores, ac si ad verbum, nihil penitus omisso, inserentur, præsentibus pro expressis habentes penitus tollimus, & omnino revocamus: cæterisque contrariis quibuscunque.

§ 26. Ut vero præsentes nostri processus ad publicam omnium notitiam facilius deducantur, Chartas seu Membranas Processus ipsos continentes, valvis Ecclesiæ S. *Joannis Lateranensis*, & *Basilicæ*, Principis Apostolorum de Urbe appendi faciemus, ut ii, quos Processus hujusmodi concernunt, quod ad ipsos non pervenerint, aut quod ipsos ignorave-

sons may help and defend themselves against these our Processes and Censures from being included in them. All which Grants, as far as relates to this matter, and the whole tenor of them, accounting them expressed in these Presents as if they had been verbatim inserted, nothing omitted, we utterly abolish and wholly revoke; and notwithstanding any other Pleas which may be alledged to the contrary.

§ 26. *But that these our present Processes may more easily come to the knowledge of all Persons; We have caused the Papers and Parchments containing the Processes themselves to be affixed in the City to the doors of the Church of S.* John Lateran, *and of the Church of the Prince of the Apostles; that those whom these Processes concern, may pretend no excuse or alledge ignorance, as if they had*

rint

rint, nullam possint excusationem pretendere aut ignorantiam allegare; cum non si verisimile, id remanere incognitum, quod tam patenter omnibus publicatur.

not come to their knowledge; since it is not probable, that should remain unknown, which is so openly published to all Men.

§ 27. Insuper ut Processus ipsi & præsentes literæ, ac omnia & singula in eis contenta, eo fiant notiora, quo in plerisq; Civitatibus & locis fuerint publicata; universis & singulis Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, & locorum Ordinariis, & Prælatis ubilibet constitutis, per hæc scripta, committimus & in vertute sanctæ obedientiæ districte præcipiendo mandamus; ut per se vel per alium seu alios præsentes literas, postquam eas receperint, seu earum habuerint notitiam, semel in anno, aut, si expedire viderint, etiam pluries, in Ecclesiis suis, dum

§ 27. *Moreover, that the Processes themselves, and these present Letters, and all and every thing contained in them may become more manifest by being published in many Cities and Places; We by these Writings intrust, and in vertue of holy obedience strictly charge and command all and singular Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, Ordinaries of Places, and Prelates wheresoever constituted, that by themselves or some other or others, after they shall have received, these present Letters, or have knowledge of them, they solemnly publish them in their Churches once a year or oftner, if they see conve-*

in

in eis major populi multitudo ad Divina convenerit, solenniter publicent, & ad Christi fidelium mentes reducant, nuncient, & declarent.

§ 28. Cæterum Patriarchæ, Archiepiscopi, Episcopi, aliique locorum Ordinarii, & Ecclesiarum Præliti, necnon Rectores, cæterique curam animarum exercentes, ac Presbyteri sæculares et quorumvis Ordinum regulares, ad audiendas peccatorum confessiones quavis authoritate deputati, transumptum præsentium Literarum penes se habeant, easq; diligenter legere & percipere studeant.

§ 29. Volentes earundum præsentium transumptis etiam impressis, Notarii publici manu subscriptis, & sigillo Judicis Ordinarii Romanæ Curiæ, vel alterius personæ in

nient, when the greater part of the People shall be met for celebration of Divine Service; put faithful Christians in mind of them, relate them, and declare them.

§ 28. Lastly, all Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and other Ordinaries of Places, and Prelates of Churches, as also all Rectors, and others having cure of Souls, and Priests secular and regular of whatsoever Orders, deputed by any authority to hear confession of sins, shall have a Transcripe of these present Letters by them, and shall diligently study to read and understand them.

§ 29. Our farther pleasure is, that the same credit in judgment and out of judgment, shall in all places be given to Copies, although Printed, of these presents, subscribed by any publick Notary,

dignitate

dignitate ecclesiastica constitutæ munitis, eandem prorsus fidem in judicio, & extra illud ubiq; locorum adhibendam fore, quæ ipsis præsentibus adhiberetur, si essent exhibitæ vel ostensæ.

§ 30. Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam nostræ excommunicationis, anathematizationis, interdicti, innovationis, innodationis, declarationis, protestationis, sublationis, revocationis, commissionis, mandati & voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Siquis autem hoc attentare præsumpserit, indignationem Omnipotentis Dei ac Beatorum *Petri* & *Pauli* Apostolorum ejus se noverit incursurum.

Datum *Romæ* apud S. *Petrum*, Anno Incarnationis Dominicæ Millessimo sexcentesimo decimo, sexto Idus

and sealed by the ordinary Judge of the Court of Rome, *or any other person in Ecclesiastical dignity; as would be given to these presents themselves, if they should be produced or shewn.*

§ 30 *Let no man therefore infringe, or boldly and rashly oppose this our Letter of Excommunication, Anathematization, Interdict, Innovation, Innodation, Declaration, Protestation, Abolition, Revocation, Commission, Command and Pleasure: But if any one shall presume to attempt it; let him know that he shall incur the displeasure of Almighty God, and of his Blessed Apostles* Peter *and* Paul.

Given at Rome *from St.* Peter, *in the year of our Lord's Incarnation, One thousand, six hundred and ten, the eighth of Aprilis,*

Aprilis, Pontificatus nostri anno quinto.

Anno a Nativitate Domini nostri *Jesu Christi* millessimo sexcentesimo decimo tertio, Indict. 11. die vero quarta mensis *Aprilis*, Pontificatus Sanctiss. in *Christo* Patris & D.N.D. *Pauli* divina providentia Papæ V. anno octavo, supradictæ literæ affixæ & publicatæ fuerunt ad Valvas Basilicarum S. *Joannis Lateranensis* & Principis Apostolorum, & in acie Campi *Floræ* per nos *Baldassarem Vacham* & *Brandimartem Latinum* Cursores.

Jacobus Brambrilla.
Mag. Curs.

April, *in the fifth year of our Popedom.*

In the year, from the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ 1613. *Indict.* 11. *the 4th day of the Month* April, *and the eighth year of the Popedom of our most Holy Father in* Christ, *and our Lord* Paul V. *by Divine Providence Pope, the aforesaid Letters were affixed and published at the Doors of the Churches of St.* John Lateran, *and the Prince of the Apostles, and in the field of* Flora, *by us* Balthazar Vacha *and* Brandimars Latini *Cursors.*

James Brambrilla.
Mag. Curs.

FINIS.

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE Parliament OF PARIS,

UPON THE

POPE'S BULL,

Concerning the Franchises in the City of *Rome*, and the following Ordonance of the *26th* of *December*, 1687.

Translated into *English* by Order of his Excellency *Monsieur Barillon*, his Most Christian Majesties Ambassadour Extraordinary to the King of *Great Britain*.

LONDON

Printed for *R. Bentley*, and are to be Sold by *Randal Taylor*, near Stationers-Hall. 1688.

An Extract out of the Registers of the Parliament of *Paris*.

THIS Day the Parliament of *Paris* being assembled, the King's Council appearing, Mr. *Denys Talon*, His Majesties Advocate-General made this following Speech, That among the rest of the Court of *Rome*'s Attempts upon several Occasions, in prejudice of the Liberties of the Church of *France*, and of the Rights and Prehemineencies of the Crown; there has been nothing observ'd in the History of late Ages, parallell to what was done in the Month of *December* last, and which is nothing more but what the Pope has been contriving many Years, in declaring himself an Enemy of *France*, &c.—

In the Assembly held upon Occasion of the Affairs of the *Regalia*, the Bishops being inform'd that the *Italian* Doctors, and the Emissaries of the Court of *Rome*, omitted not any means to spread about the Kingdom, the *new Opinions* of the Popes Infallibility, and the Indirect Power which *Rome* strives to usurp over the Temporality of Kings; that Assembly, We say, did not pretend to frame a Decision of a doubtful Controversie; but give a Publick and Authentick Testimony of a certain Truth, taught by all the Fathers of the Church, and determined by all the Councils, and especially by those of *Constance* and *Basile*. And it's well

known

known that the Cardinal of *Lorrain* assisting at the Council of *Trent*, publickly declared that the Faculty of Divinity at *Paris*, the Universities of the Kingdom, and in a word, all *France* was persuaded, that the Pope, far from being Infallible, ought to submit to the Decisions of Councils, and it does not appear that this Assertion, made him incurr any Reproach from the Court of *Rome*.

Yet has the World with amazement seen, that the Pope look upon this Declaration as an injury done to his Authority; insomuch, that the King having nominated to the Episcopacy, some of those that assisted at that Assembly; and who are as well recommendable for their Piety and Virtue, as for their Knowledge and Learning; Bulls were refused them, on pretence that they do not make Profession of a sound Doctrine.

If this foundation is solid, we are like to have no more Bishops for the future; Since all the Ecclesiasticks of the Kingdom, and particularly those that in the Universities take the necessary Degrees to attain to Prelacies, with an invincible steddiness maintain the Propositions which the Pope complains of.

Tho' this refusal has not the least glimmering of Reason, yet does it nevertheless, raise a very great Scandal, and produce Disorders, beyond expression. And indeed, the Pope's Obstinacy is the Cause, that thirty five Cathedral Churches remain destitute of Pastors, and this in a time when a vast number of newly

Converted Persons stand in need of Instruction, for their being fortified and confirmed in the Orthodox Belief, and when the Presence of the Bishops is very necessary in their Dioceses.

Who could ever imagine that the Pope, who is proposed to us as an Image of Holiness and Virtue, should remain so wedded to his Opinions, and so jealous of the shadow of an Imaginary Authority, that he should leave the third part of the Churches of *France* Vacant because We will not own him to be Infallible!

Those that inspire these thoughts into the Pope, can they fancy they shall make us change our Opinions? And are they so blind, as not to know that those Unhappy times are past, when a gross ignorance joined to a Faintness in the Government, and false Prepossessions, rendred the Pope's Decrees so very dreadful, however unjust they might be; and that those Disputes and Quarrels, far from augmenting their Power, do only serve to cause enquiry to be made into the Origine of their Usurpations, and lessen the Veneration of the People rather than encrease it? *Ibi.*

And to give some colour to so scandalous an Innovation, he refers to that famous Bull, stil'd *in Cœna Domini*, because it is read at *Rome* every *Thursday* of the Holy Week. True it is, that if this Decree, whereby the Popes Declare themselves Soveraign Monarchs of the World, be legitimate; the Majesty Royal will then depend on their humour, all our Liberties

will

will be abolish'd, the Secular Judges will no longer have the Power to try the Possession of Beneficies, nor the Civil and Criminal Causes of Ecclesiastical Persons; and we shall quickly see our selves brought under the yoke of the Inquisition.

Thus, however unjust and abusive this new Decree may be, it is much less dangerous by the frivolous Menaces it contains, than by its being built upon a Title altogether void and vicious; and that in this Conjuncture, it looks as if *Rome* would at present follow the steps of *Julius* the 2d. renew his Animosity and Rage against *France*, without making reflection how odious his Memory is in the Christian Common-wealth.

When Pope *Gregory* the 4th meaning to render himself Arbitrator of the Dispute that arose between *Lewis* the *Debonnair* and his Children, threatned the Bishops of *France* to Excommunicate them if they did not close with his Designs: Those Prelates being surprized at a Procedure so contrary to the Canons, courageously answer'd, That *they would not obey the Pope's Will; and that if he come with a design to Excommunicate them, he should himself return Excommunicated: Si Excommunicaturus veniret, Excommunicatus abiret*; as if they meant to say, That he, who without lawful Cause, and through humane Motives, undertakes to suspend one of the Members of *Jesus Christ* from the Communion of the Church, does seperate himself from it by such an unjust attempt.

Let us further urge, that the ill use which the Popes have in so many Occasions made of the Authority with which they are entrusted in giving it no other Bounds than those of their own will, has been the source of almost all the incurable Mischiefs, with which the Church is afflicted, and the most specious Pretences of the Hereticks and Schismaticks that the last Age produc'd, so as the Divines assembled by Pope *Paul* the Third's Order, did sincerely own; and besides at present, the bare Idea of the Infallibility, and indirect Power which the Complaisance of the *Italian* Doctor does Attribute to the See of *Rome*, upon the Temporality of Princes, is one of the greatest Obstacles that oppose the Conversion, not only of individual Persons, but of whole Provinces; and Peoples minds cannot be too thoroughly convinc'd that these new Opinions do not make part of the Doctrine of the Universal Church *&c.*——

If he had been an Envoy from the Emperour of the *Turks*, from the King of *Persia*, or some other Infidel Prince, he would not have been so rigorously us'd. Is it that the Pope means to have no more Commerce with *France*? Is he persuaded that his Power reaches no farther than the Diocess of *Rome*, and his Partriarchship than the Neighbouring Provinces, stiled Suburbicarial? Does he intend to renounce the Quality of *Head of the Church*, and *Common Father of the Faithful*? *&c.*——

And in this occasion the Thunders of the *Vaticum* have nothing formidable; they are

Transitory

Transitory Fires, that exhale into smoak, and which do neither hurt nor prejudice, save to those who darted them.

And tho' this Bull be neither publish'd nor executed in the Kingdom, it is not the less abusive. We do not doubt, but that a more moderate Pope, reflecting upon the disorders which such an Innovation is capable of producing, would imitate the Example of *Clement* the Fifth, who, by a solemn Decree, did for ever abolish the memory of what his Predecessor *Boniface* the Eight had unjustly undertaken against King *Philip* the Fair; And this Retractation, which proves that the Popes are not Infallible, since the one destroys what the other had built; among others, revokes the Bull, *Unam Sanctam*; wherein *Boniface*, whose proud Conduct was blamed by the whole Church, declares that the Sword of Sovereigns is subjected to the Popes Spiritual Faulchion, *&c.*——

If then we put in an Appeal to the future Council against the Censures contain'd in the Bull, and against the Interdict that is a Consequence and accessary of it; it is because that not only the Decisions of Popes, but their very Person, when they fail in their Duty in the Government of the Church, is to submit to the Correction and Reformation of the General Council, in what regards as well Faith as Discipline. An indisputable Truth whence We shall never depart, whatever endeavours the Partizans of the Court of *Rome* may use.

The Pope's denying to grant Bulls to all the Bishops nominated by the King, occasions a Disorder that daily augments, and which requires a speedy and efficacious Remedy. The Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* having endeavoured to contrive some moderation to the Court of *Rome's* Usurpations, and to the Confusion that was introduced in the distribution of Benefices, the pragmatick Sanction was afterwards compos'd of the Decrees of those Councils. But the Popes thereby perceiving their Authority to diminish, made use of all sorts of Artifices to abolish it; and by the Concordate made between King *Francis* the 1*st*. and by Pope *Leo* the 10*th*, they regulated the manner of disposing of Bishopricks and Abbies: To the Pope was granted not only the devolution, but also the prevention and the power of admitting the Resignations in favour, and many other Articles that are very burdensome to the ordinary Collaters, and absolutely contrary to the Ancient Canons.

And indeed our Fore fathers did for a long while complain against the *Concordate*. The Ordinance of *Orleans* did re-establish the Elections; and it would be very advantageous that all Ecclesiastical Matters were transacted in the Kingdom, without ever being obliged to have recourse to *Rome*. In the sequel nevertheless the *Concordate* was sincerely executed on our part; and it is inconceiveable that the *Pope* should now, through an invincible Obstinacy, reduce us to deprive him of the profit, which

which the Court of *Rome* derives from a Treaty, which is so much to its advantage.

The King is most Religious, in nominating to the Prelacies Ecclesiasticks of an exemplary Integrity, and of conspicuous merit; and because that these Ecclesiasticks do not believe that the *Pope* is *INFALLIBLE*; that they do not like the *Italian* Doctors, attribute to him the Title of *Universal Monarch*; that they are persuaded He has no power, either direct or indirect, over the Temporality of Kings, and that He is to all intents inferiour to the Councils, that have a right to Correct him, and to Reform His Decisions. The *Pope* upon this imaginary pretence, refuses them *BULLS*, and leaves the third part of the Churches of the Kingdom destitute of *Pastors*. Is this imitating the Care and Lenity of the Apostles in the Government of the Church?

After all, before the *Concordate*, those that were Elected by the Clergy and the people, and afterwards by the Chapters, in presence of one of the Kings Commissioners: Were they not Ordained by the *Metropolitan*, assisted by the Bishops of the Province, after that the King had approved of their Election? The Right acquired to the King by the *Concordate*, being Authorized in this respect by the Tacit consent of the whole *Gallian Church*, and confirmed by a possession of near two Centuries, ought so much the less to receive any Change and Invasion, that during the first four Ages of the Monarchy, they went not to *Rome* to demand Institution and Induction of Benefices:

ces: The Bishops Dispos'd of all those that were vacant in their Dioceses; and our Kings did almost ever nominate to the Bishopricks; and as they sometimes granted the Clergy and the people the liberty of Electing a Pastor; they often reserv'd the choice of him to themselves; he they had chosen was immediately Consecrated, without the Popes intermedling in the Matter. Who hinders us from following these Examples, grounded upon this excellent Reason, That the Right, which all the Faithful had in the beginning of appointing themselves a Head; being no longer to be exercised in common, ought to pass into the Power of the Soveraign, on whom the Subjects rely for the Government of the State; of which the Church is the noblest part.

But as to the *Pope*, since He refuses to join the Concourse of His Authority to the Kings Nomination: We may presume, that He means to discharge Himself of the painful burden which overwhelms Him; and that His Infirmities not permitting Him to extend His Pastoral Diligence over all the parts of the *Universal Church*; the Devolution that is made in case of negligence, sometimes even from the Superiour to the Inferiour, may Authorize the Bishops to lay their Hands on those that shall be Nominated by the King to the Prelacies; His Nomination having as much, or more effect, than the Election of the people and the Clergy, which ought, without difficulty, to

be

be Confirmed by the Immediate Superiour; when an unworthy person was not chosen.

And if the like resolution requires the being accompanied with some temperament; If it requires the Bishops Concurrence: The King may be besought to convene the Provincial Councils, or if need be, a National Council; therein to take Resolutions suitable to the Occasions of the *Gallican* Church.

And as the Evil seems urgent, and that there would be possibly some danger in venturing upon the delays that are inseparable to the holding of a National Council, His Majesty may assemble such as he pleases of the principal Officers, of the Bishops, and considerable Persons of all the Orders of his Realm, to take their advice in so important an Affair.

But it is not just, that while that the *Pope* refuses to Execute the *Concordate* in one of its principal Articles, he does, nevertheless, enjoy the Advantages that are granted him by that Treaty, which contains Conventions reciprocally obligatory; that people continue to go to *Rome*, and thither carry Money, for the obtaining either the Institutions of Benefices or Dispensations, that may be easily expediated in the Kingdom.

Now if we purpose to break off this Traffick, it is only because it ceases to be reciprocal; and Because that the Pope by his Obstinacy, interposing an invincible impediment to the Expedition of the Bulls of a great number of Bishopricks. It would be a shame to suffer

suffer that the *Gallican* Church should remain burden'd with the Yoke of Prevention of Resignations in favour, and of all the other Servitudes whereunto *France* was content to submit by the *Concordate*.

And herein We do but faintly repel the Injury that is done Us: We oppose the Buckler of our Liberties against a New and Un-exampled Enterprize. Calamity and Anathema, to those that out of Interest or Caprice, disturb the Correspondence that ought to be between the Priesthood and the Royalty. Who seem to have no other Aim than to raise a Schism in the Church, and by fatal Divisions disturb the Peace which all *Europe* enjoys, and which was procured It by the Valour and Wisdom of our Invincible Monarch.

But whatever endeavours those factious Spirits may use that possess the Pope and abuse the power which his great Age and Infirmities oblige him to give them in the Government of the Church, We shall ever remain inseparably united to the Holy See, We will acknowledge Saint *Peter*'s Successor as the first and the chief of the Bishops, We will most Religiously maintain the Communion and Correspondence with the Church of *Rome*, and we will defend our selves with as much moderation as vigour against the Insults, Invasions, and Innovations contrary to the King's Rights, to the Dignity of his Crown, to the Decrees of the Councils, to the General Policy of our Church and to our Liberties.

All

All these Reasons, and a world of others which we omit, oblige us to require that it would please the Court to admit Us as appealing against the Abuse of the Bull, dated in the Month of *May* last, and of the Ordinance given in pursuance thereof: And upon our Appeal, to declare the said *Bull* and *Ordinance* void and abusive; making Prohibition to all Persons, of vending them in the Kingdom, on pain of being proceeded against according to the severity of the Law; enjoyning all those that have Copies of them, to bring them to the Register of the Court, in order to their being suppressed: As likewise, to order that the Act of Appeal, made by the Attorney General to the future Council, be Registred in the Register of the Court: That the King shall be most humbly besought to employ his Authority for the maintaining of the Franchises, and the Immunity of the Quarter of his Ambassadours at *Rome*, in the whole Extent that they have hitherto had: Moreover that His Majesty may be humbly desired to order the holding of Provincial Councils, nay and of a National Council, if need be, or the Assembly of the Nobles of his Realm; and after having heard their advice to choose the means he shall reckon most fitting, for the hindring the Disorders which the vacancy of so many Arch-bishopricks and Bishopricks in the Kingdom do produce, and prevent the Increase and Progress of so dangerous an Evil. We further require that the King be also most humbly besought

to

to forbid his Subjects to have any Commerce in the mean while with *Rome*, and of sending any Money thither, and in this to interpose his Authority as far as he shall judge convenient, and that it be ordered by the Court that the Arrest that shall intervene upon our present Conclusions, shall be affix't in the publick Places, and every where as shall be needful in the wonted manner.

The King's Council being withdrawn, a Copy being perus'd, Printed at *Rome* of a *Bull* concerning the *Franchises* of the Quarters of the said Town, and of the following Ordinance of *December* 26. last, together with the Act of Appeal put into the future Council by the King's Attorney General the 28th of this Month, and the Conclusions by him taken in writing, the Matter being brought under Debate.

The Attorney General's appealing from the abuse of the said Bull, and of the following Ordinance on the 26th of *November* last, the Court admitted of the said Appeal, and declares the said Bull and Ordinance as null and abusive; Prohibits all Persons whatsoever to vend them in the Kingdom, on pain of being proceeded against according to the severity of the Law; enjoining those that have Copies of them to bring them to the Register of the Court, there to be suppressed; orders that the Act of Appeal put in by the King's Attorney General to the future Council, shall be registred in the Register of the Court, and that the King shall be most humbly desired to employ

ploy his Authority for the maintaining the Franchises and Immunities of the Quarter of his Ambassadors in the Court of *Rome*, in the whole extent they have hitherto had, to order the holding of Provincial Councils, or even of a National Council, or an Assembly of the Nobles of His Kingdom, so to advise about the most suitable Means for the Remedying the Disorders which the long Vacancy of several Archbishopricks and Bishopricks, has therein introduced, and to prevent the progress and encrease of them, and in the mean while to forbid his Subjects in such manner as the said Lord the King shall judge convenient to have any Commerce, or remit any Money into the Court of *Rome*. And this present Arrest to be affix'd in the public and usual Places of this Town, and every where as shall be needful. Done in Parliament on the 23*d*. of *Jan*. 1688.

Sign'd *Jacques.*

Act of the Appeal put in by the Attorney General to the Council upon the Subject of the Pope's *Bull concerning the Franchises in the City of* Rome, *and of the following Ordonnance on the* 26th. *of* December *last.*

BEfore the underwritten Apostolical Notary was present in his own Person, *Messire Achilles de Harlay*, Councellor of the King in his Council of State, and his Majesties Attorney General, who in the Presence, and by the Advice

vice and Council of *Messire Denis Talon* and of *Messire Francois Criteau de la Moignon* also, Counsellors of the King in his Council of State, and his Advocates General in his Court of Parliament, has declared that having some time since seen Copies of a Bull given on the 12*th.* of *May* last past, by our Holy Father Pope *Innocent* the 11*th*, concerning the Franchises which certain Persons are in Possession of enjoying in the City of *Rome*, he could not have imagined that his Holiness could have conceived the design of comprehending the Ambassadors which the King was willing to send to him, in the general Menaces of Excommunication which he judg'd convenient to insert therein, contrary to the Use observed by other Popes in the Bulls made by them; he had hoped that if the Remembrance of the Sovereign Power which the Kings, his Majesty's Predecessors exercised in *Rome* of their Liberalities to the Holy See, and of the Protection they gave to several Popes, could not induce this Pope to cause to be rendred to the King in the Persons of his Ministers, Honours and Testimonies of Acknowledgment proportionable to his Bounties, at least his Holiness as visible Head of the Church, would not be insensible to the Prodigies which the King had perform'd before his Eyes for the re-uniting in the Bosom of this good Mother so vast a number of Children that were gone astray from her, that he would be affected with the Piety of this Prince, and the powerful Protection he continually gives

to

to Prelates, tho' he was not with his Victories and Power; and that he would not enter into dispute with him about Rights that had not suffered any Invasion, even for several years under his Popedom.

But being informed that his Holiness had given order to the Cardinal that is his Vicar in *Rome*, to declare the Church of St. *Lewis* of the said City, and the Ecclesiastics that officiate in it, interdicted for having admitted to the participation of the holy Mysteries and Sacraments on the Night wherein is celebrated the Solemnity of our Lords Nativity; *Monsieur le Marquis de Lavardin* the Kings Ambassador extraordinary to his Holiness, and that it was supposed by the Ordonance delivered upon this Subject, that he was notoriously Excommunicated for pretended Contraventions to this Bull, the said Attorney General did not think that he could without being wanting to his Duty, remain any longer in the Silence he had hitherto kept.

Now if the Matter which has given an occasion to so great an Excess, did concern the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction which belongs to the Pope, he would easily shew the Errors that have been committed by proceeding against a Person that has not been particularly specified in that Bull, to whom the State of Matters has not been signified since his being at *Rome*, who might be ignorant of them in *France*, where it was not publisht, that the Pope could not condemn him as an Ambassador tho' his Character

ought to secure him from those Thunders, in regard of his Functions, yet His Holiness would not so much as hear or own him in that Quality, whatever Addresses he has caus'd to be made for that purpose, and that in fine, the very Rules of the Canon Law requires that Persons of so eminent a Dignity, as is that of his, should be pointed out by Name in Bulls of that Nature, before they can incur the Penalties they utter.

But that the Pope in a Matter purely Temporal, as are these Franchises of the Kings Ambassadors, having made use of the Spiritual Arms, which he is only entrusted withal for the Conduct and Edification of the Church, and having constituted himself Judge in his own Cause, the Excommunication which his Holiness's Cardinal Vicar declares to have been incurr'd, is so null, that there is no occasion for any Proceedings to annihilate it, and those that are therein comprehended, ought not to receive Absolution, though it were even offered them at their own Homes.

And indeed the said King's Attorney General does with all the *French* expect from his Majesty's single Power the Reparation which these Proceedings challenge, and the Conservation of those Franchises which only depend on the Judgment of God, as all the Rights of this Crown, and which can admit of no Diminution but such as the King's Moderation and Justice may give them.

But

But as not any thing can contribute more to lessen in the Minds of Shallow Persons and Libertins the Veneration which People ought to have for the Power of the Church, than the ill use which its Ministers may make of it; the King's said Attorney General declares, that he is appealing, as indeed he appeals by the present Act from the abusive use that is made of it in the said Bull and Ordonance, not to our Holy Father Pope *Innocent* the 11*th* better informed, so as has been practised in respect of some of his Predecessors; when that they had true Ideas of their Power, that their Years allowed them to act of themselves; their might be hopes that in time they might be brought to know the Justice and Truth of the Complaints that were brought before them; and that neither the Preventions in favour of their Country, nor the Partialities of those they honoured with their Trust, did not prevail over the Obligations which the Quality of Common Father of all *Christians* does impose.

Protesting to carry on this his said Appeal upon this Grievance, and upon the others, which he reserves to represent to the first General Council that shall be held, as the Tribunal truly Sovereign and Infallible of the Church, to which its visible Head must submit, as well as its other Members; and therein to further among other things a Regulation that shall prevent the Employing so Holy an Authority in Uses so far from those for which it was confided in the Church in the Person of St. *Peter*;

this may make the Pope be mindful, that God having separated the two Powers of the Priesthood, and of Empire, His Holiness cannot make use of the Authority of the first for the Rights that depend on the second; that according to Temporal Laws he ought to possess those large Territories which his Predecessors have received from the Liberality of Temporal Princes, and particularly from that of our Kings, and that in short, he would consider upon a Truth which a great Arch-bishop in *France* wrote to one of his Predecessors; that a Prelate that excommunicates a *Christian* contraty to the Rules, and for Rights of a Kingdom of the Earth, may, in such an Occasion well lose the Power of binding and unbinding which his Character gives him; but that he cannot deprive of eternal Life, him to whom he does this Injustice. if his Sins do not render him unworthy of the Mercy of God. Of which the said Attorney General has required of us as an Act. Done in the Court, in the Presence of the Kings Council. on the 22d. day of *January*, in the Year 1688.

Monsignor, Sin. Not.

Printed at Paris *by* Francis Muquets, *the King and his Parliaments chief Printer*, *Street* le Harp, 1688. *With His Majesties Privilege.*

FINIS.

Cleri *Gallicani* De Ecclesiastica Potestate Declaratio. A. D. 1682.

I. Beato *Petro*, ejusque successoribus Christi vicariis, ipsique Ecclesiæ rerum Spiritualium, & ad Æternam salutem pertinentium non autem Civilium ac Temporalium a Deo traditam Potestatem, dicente Domino, *Regnum meum non est de hoc Mundo.* Et Iterum, *Reddite quæ sunt Cæsaris Cæsari, & quæ sunt Dei Deo*, ac proinde stare Apostolicum illud, *Omnis anima Potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit. Non est enim Potestas nisi à Deo. Quæ autem sunt, à Deo ordinatæ sunt. Itaque qui Potestati Resistit, Dei ordinationi Resistit.* Reges ergo et Principes in Temporalibus nulli Ecclesiasticæ Potestati Dei ordinatione subjici,

The Declaration of the Gallican Clergy, *concerning the* Ecclesiastical Power *in the Year* 1682.

I. *That God gave to St.* Peter *and his Successors Vicars of Christ, and to the* Church *her Self the Power of* Spiritual *things pertaining to Eternal Life, but not of* Civil *and* Temporal *Matters. For the Lord said* My Kingdom is not of this World, And again, *Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.* And *therefore that of the Apostle must stand,* Let every Soul be subject to the Higher-Powers, for ther is no Power but of God, the Powers that be are Ordained of God; whosoever therefore Resisteth the Power, Resisteth the Ordinance of God. *Therefore* Kings *and* Princes *are not subject, in* Temporals, *to any* Ecclesiastical *Power, by the Or-*

neque

neque Autoritate Clavium Ecclesiæ directe vel indirecte Deponi, aut illorum subditos eximi a Fide, atque Obedientia, ac præstito Fidelitatis Sacramento solvi posse, Eamque sententiam Publicæ Tranquillitati necessariam, nec minus Ecclesiæ quam Imperio utilem, ut verbo Dei, Patrum traditioni, et Sanctorum Exemplis consonam omnino retinendam.

II. Sic autem inesse Apostolicæ sedi, ac *Petri* successoribus Christi vicariis rerum Spiritualium plenam Potestatem, ut simul valeant atque immota consistant Sanctæ Oecumenicæ synodi *Constantiensis* a sede Apostolica comprobata, ipsorumque Romanorum Pontificum, ac totius Ecclesiæ usu confirmata, atque ab Ecclesia *Gal-*

dinance of God, neither can they, by Authority of the Keys *of the* Church, *Directly or Indirectly, be* Depos'd, *or their Subjects Absolv'd from their Faith and Obedience, and Oath of Allegiance which they have taken.*

And this is to be firmly Retain'd, as Necessary to the Publick Peace, and not less Useful to the Church *than to the* State, *as being Consonant to the* Word *of* God, *the* Tradition *of the* Fathers, *and* Practice *of the* Saints.

II. *But that the full Power of Spiritual Things is so in the* Apostolical See, *and the* Successors *of* Peter, *the* Vicars *of* Christ, *that the* Decrees *of the* Holy *and* Oecumenical Council *of* Constance, *concerning the Authority of* General Councils, *which are contain'd in the* 4*th and* 5*th* Sessions, *Approved by the* Apostolical See, *and Confirmed by the* Usu

licana,

licana perpetua Religione custodita Decreta de Autoritate Conciliorum Generalium, quæ Sess. 4. & 5. continentur; nec probari a *Gallicana* Ecclesia, qui eorum Decretorum, quasi Dubiæ sint Autoritatis, ac minus approbata, robur infringant; aut ad solum Schismatis tempus Concilii dicta detorquent.

III. Hinc Apostolicæ Potestatis usum Moderandum per Canones, Spiritu Dei Conditos & totius Mundi Reverentia consecratos Valere etiam Regulas, Mores & Instituta a Regno & Ecclesia *Gallicana* recepta, Patrumque terminos manere Inconcussus; atque id pertinere ad Amplitudinem Apostolicæ sedis, ut Statua & Consuetudines tantæ sedis, &

of the Popes *of* Rome *themselves, and the whole* Church, *and kept with perpetual Veneration by the* Gallican Church, *shou'd likewise Remain of Force and Unshaken.*

Nor are they Approv'd by the Gallican Church, *who wou'd Infringe the Strength of those* Decrees, *as if they were of Doubtful Authority or less Authentick, or who wou'd Wrest the Words of the Council only to the time of* Schism.

III. *Hence the Use of the* Apostolical Power *is to be Moderated by the* Canons, *Framed by the* Spirit *of* God, *and Consecrated by the Veneration of the Whole World. And likewise the* Rules, Customs, *and* Institutions *which have been Receiv'd by the Kingdom and* Gallican Church *are to be in Force, and the Bounds of our Fathers to Remain Unshaken; And that this is for the Eminence of* Eccle-

Ecclesiarum Consensione firmatæ propriam stabilitatem obtineant.

the Apostolical See, *that the* Statutes *and* Usages *of so Great a* See, *and* Establish'd *by the* Consent *of the* Churches, *should obtain their proper Stability.*

IV. In Fidei quoque Quæstionibus præcipuas summi Pontificis esse Partes, ejusque Decreta ad omnes & singulas Ecclesias pertinere, nec tamen Irreformabile esse Judicium, nisi Ecclesiæ Consensus accesserit.

IV. *The* Pope *likewise has the Chief Part in Questions concerning the* Faith, *and his* Decrees *have Respect to All and Singular Churches. But Nevertheless his Judgment is not* Irreformable, *except the Consent of the* Church *go along with it.*

Spinckes, Nathaniel

THE

CASE

Farther Stated,

Between the

Church of Rome

AND THE

Church of *England*,

Wherein the Chief Point, about the

SUPREMACY

Is Fully Discuss'd:

In a DIALOGUE between a *Roman Catholick*, and a Member of the *Church of* England.

LONDON:

Printed for *George Strahan*, at the *Golden Ball*, against the *Royal Exchange*, 1718.

Spinckes, Nathaniel

THE

CONTENTS.

Some

SECTION VI.

SECTION VII.

SECTION VIII.

The

THE CASE Farther Stated.

The INTRODUCTION.

Rom. Cath. WELL met, Sir. Since you have undertaken to encounter my good Friend, the Author of the *Case Restated*; who is since dead, and so not in a Condition to speak for himself, I hope you will not be offended, that I, as a dutiful Son of the same Church with him, take upon me to appear in his stead, to maintain those Truths he has asserted in its Defence.

Member of the Church of England. By no means, Sir; only I must beg to be excus'd, that my Circumstances will not allow me to engage in so large an Undertaking, as it would be to consider the several Attacks you have made upon some of

our most eminent Writers against your Church and Religion. This is a Work I must leave for such as have more leisure for Controversy than I have; and whose Condition may enable them better to get Books of this nature printed than I can. Which makes it necessary for me to apply my self more particularly to what concerns the *Case truly Stated*; in Relation to which you chiefly insist upon the *Question of the Supremacy.*

R. C. I do so.

M. C. E. For this Reason I shall take leave presently to treat with you about it. But I am first to return you Thanks in the *Vindicator's* Name, for the undeserv'd Compliment you bestow'd upon him, in the entrance of your Preface to the first Part of the *True Church of Christ shew'd*, &c. and to assure you that if it be spoken ironically, he shall not be at all concern'd at it, but if intended as an obliging Encomium of him, he is too sensible of his own Defects to value himself upon it; how much soever he may be engag'd to you for it. But I am not willing to detain you in the Porch; and therefore having thus discharg'd my Trust in this Respect, if you please, we will proceed to your Objections, to consider the weight and force of them.

R. C. With all my Heart, as soon as you please.

M. C. E. The Point then we are chiefly to insist upon is, as I said, *the Supremacy.*

R. C. And what have you to say against it?

M. C. E. My Business I take it, is rather to hear what you have to say for it; and of what use all you can say will be for upholding so great, indeed so insupportable a Weight, as will lye upon it. Be pleas'd therefore to begin.

R. C. That I shall do most readily.

M. C. E. Agreed.

SECT. I.

R. C. YOU cannot but have observ'd, that I begin with telling you, (*a*) *tho' the Church and State may comprehend the very same Persons, they have yet so different a Relation both to the End, the Principle, and the Rules of Government, that he who is the Head in either of them, may be a Subject in the other.*

M. C. E. Very well, Sir: And I hope you do not expect I will contest this with you: Nor do I see any thing in our 37th Article that requires it of me; neither can I apprehend why you mention'd it, but only to have a Flirt at King *Henry* the VIIIth, who you may remember, tho' he quarrel'd with the Pope and disown'd his Supremacy, liv'd however and died in the Profession of the *Romish Religion.* And so whatever Objections you have against him terminate in one amongst your selves.

R. C. He not only disown'd the Supremacy of St. *Peter*, but was guilty also of most vile and abominable Sacrilege, in *seizing the Lands and Revenues of a great number of Religious Houses*, p. 2.

C. E. I have already told you, it was one who profess'd himself of your Church, that did this. It was also in your Church, and by the Popes themselves, (*b*) that the Tithes were taken away from the *Church-men*, (*c*) *to whom alone*, (F. Simon acknowledges) *they belong according to both Natural and Evangelical Law, and the Monks endowed*

(*a*) Part 3. p. 1.

(*b*) *F. Simon's* Hist. of Eccle. Revenues, p. 44.

(*c*) Ibid.

 there-

therewith, which was no better (*a*) than sacrilegious Robbery of the Parishes from which they were taken: and not only so, *but private Men would also have Churches, of which they received the Profits, in imitation of the Canons and Monks, and had the Cure supplied by Vicars.* The same F. *Simon* tell us moreover (*b*) that *Philip* the IId, King of *Spain* enjoy'd *a good part of the Tithes of the Churches within his Territories.* And it is natural to suppose that the Pope's Bulls for empowering Cardinal *Wolsey*, to demolish the Monastry of St. *Frideswide* in *Oxford*, together with other Religious Houses, and Rectories Impropriate, tho' in order to the building his two Colledges, might easily be made by King *Henry* an Encouragement to himself to do the like in other Instances, though not with the same Design, but only to satisfy his own Covetousness, and gratify his Dependents. Especially if it be true as Bishop *Burnet* relates, (*c*) *That these Houses thus suppress'd by the Law belonged to the King*, and the Cardinal could not have them till made over by him. So that I cannot but think that for your own sakes you should be more sparing in your Clamours of this Nature, since in reality they reflect so shamefully upon your selves.

R. C. But was it not an intolerable Usurpation, that your *Henry* the VIIIth, took upon him to be Head of the Church? *Ibid.*

C. E. I have told you, this was a King of your own Religion, though none of the most obedient of them. And you know our later Princes have not claim'd that Title. And besides, your own fore mention'd F. *Simon* informs us, that (*d*) the Kings of *Spain*, and their Viceroys in

(*a*) P. 68, &c. (*b*) p. 233. (*c*) Hist. of Reform. Vol. I. l. 1. p. 22. (*d*) Hist. Eccles. Reven. p. 116.

Sicily,

Sicily, acknowledg'd not the Pope's Authority, and had Power to Absolve, Punish, and Excommunicate all sorts of Persons, whether Laicks or Ecclesiasticks, Monks, Priests, Abbots, Bishops, and even Cardinals, residing in that Kingdom.

R. C. But this Spiritual Power was lodg'd next in a Child. *Ibid.*

C. E. I hope whatever Power was lodg'd in King *Edward* the VIth, you will not allow to be compar'd with what your Popes pretend to, and in particular with that of Pope *John* XII. of whom yet your own zealous Historian *Baronius* shews, (*a*) that he must necessarily have been Pope, and possibly some Years, under the Age of Eighteen. Or if this be not sufficient, it were easy to remind you, from the same *Baronius*, of another Pope, I mean *Benedict* IX. invested with the Pontifical Power, and so made Head of the Church, in a far higher Sense than King *Edward* pretended to, at (*b*) Ten or Twelve Years of Age. So that you might as well have let this Reflection alone, for any thing you will get by it; for you see it is no such wonder amongst yourselves, to have a Boy made Head of the Church (*c*) and owned as such. But any thing serves for an Objection against us, though at the same time it bear ever so much harder upon your selves.

R. C. But once more, You have not only given this Prerogative to a blustering King, and to a Child, but to a Woman likewise. *Ibid.*

C. E. And why I pray might not a Queen be call'd, The Head of the *English* Church, with as little Offence, as a Pope *Joan* could be Head of the *Roman*, and according to the Mo-

(*a*) *Anno* 955. (*b*) *Anno* 1033. VI. (*c*) VII.

dern

dern Doctrine avowed by you all, of all other Churches? Yet the learned *Maresius* cites near Eighty Authors, and almost all of them your own, for the Proof of your having had such a Pope. And I am very confident, you will not be able to name any one Writer of any Authority, that ever took upon him to deny it, till the time of the Reformation. Besides that, it is worth your while to observe, what the foreclied F. *Simon* relates of the Queens of *Sicily*; (*a*) That *seeing in the Kingdom of* Sicily, *the Female succeeded as well as in* England, *a Princess might take the Title of Head of the Church of* Sicily, *and of* Beatissimo & Santissimo Padre. *Nay*, says he, *it hath happened so already in the time of* Joan *of* Arragon *and* Castile, *the Mother of* Charles V. Look now Sir, try whether you do not plainly see your own Face, naturally and lively represented, in the Picture you been drawing for us. The truth is, it fits you much the better of the two; not only because we give not now that Title of Head of the Church to our Princes, but because when they had it, it was always allow'd to imply much less in it, than has been for many Centuries assumed by your Popes, and ascrib'd to them by their Flatterers, whosoever or howsoever qualified they have been. As will plainly appear, if you will but be pleased to cast your Eye upon the XXXVIIth Article of the Church of *England*, in which you will find (*b*) these words; "Where

(*a*) *Hist. of Eccl. Reven.* p. 117.

(*b*) Whereto also agrees, what we find in the *Admonition to simple Men deceived by malicious*, towards the end of the *Queen's Injunctions*, in the Year 1559. "And further, "her Majesty forbiddeth all manner her Subjects, to give "ear or credit to such perverse and malicious Persons, "which most sinisterly and maliciously labour to notify to "her

"Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty "the chief Government, by which Titles we "understand the Minds of some dangerous "Folks to be offended: We give not our Prin-"ces, the ministring either of God's Word, or "of the Sacraments, the which thing the In-"junctions also set forth by *Elizabeth* our Queen "do most plainly testify; but that only Prero-"gative, which we see to have been given al-"ways to all Godly Princes in Holy Scriptures, "by God himself, that is, that they should rule "all Estates and Degrees, committed to their "charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiasti-"cal or Temporal, and restrain with the civil "Sword the stubborn and evil doers." Whence it appears, to a Demonstration, that if by *a Spiritual Supremacy* given to our Princes, you mean a Power to act as a Spiritual Person, to Ordain,

---

"her loying Subjects, how by words of the said Oath it "may be collected, that the Kings or Queens of this "Realm, Possessors of the Crown, may challenge Autho-"rity and Power of Ministry of Divine Service in the "Church, wherein her said Subjects be much abused by "such evil disposed Persons. For certainly Her Majesty "neither doth, nor ever will challenge any Authority, than "what was challenged, and lately used by the said noble "Kings of famous Memory, King *Henry* VIII. and King "*Edward* VI. which is, and was of antient time due to "the Imperial Crown of this Realm, that is, under God, "to have the Soveraignty and Rule over all manner of "Persons born within these her Realms, Dominions, and "Countries, of what Estate, either Ecclesiastical or Tem-"poral soever they be, so as no other Foreign Power "shall, or ought to have any Superiority over them. "And if any Person that hath conceived any other Sense "of the Form of the said Oath, shall accept the same "Oath with this Interpretation, Sense or Meaning, Her "Majesty is well pleased to accept every such in that be-"half, as her good and obedient Subjects, and shall acquit "them of all manner of Penalties contain'd in the said "Act, &c.

Confirm,

Confirm, Excommunicate, *&c.* you are most grosly mistaken. If you mean only a Civil Supremacy over all Persons, as well Ecclesiasticks as Laity, with a Power and Authority, to see that they all in their several Stations perform their Duty, and faithfully discharge the Offices committed to them, and inflict all necessary Civil Penalties upon the refractory and disobedient, you may give this as many hard Names as you please, but will never prove it a greater Power, than justly belongs to all Christian Princes.

As for Mr. *St.* the Author of the *Observations upon the Essay*, &c. as he professed not to be of our Church, so neither was he a Man of that either Learning or Prudence, that his Judgment was ever had any regard to, amongst those that knew him much better than you can be supposed to have done. And therefore till you can produce some other more considerate, and less prejudiced Writer against us, I shall not need to concern my self, for any thing he was pleased to charge us with. Yet you frequently produce him, and I know not what Author of the *English Atlas* against us, as if they were Men of Figure amongst us. But it is only for want of such as are so.

R. C. The Reformation of the Church of England *was ushered in, and confirm'd, by the Spiritual Supremacy of Kings, and Authority of Parliaments*, p. 6.

C. E. The learned Bishop of *Derry*, and afterwards of *Armagh*, Bishop *Brambal*, (*b*) has told you long ago, That *the Secession and Substraction of Obedience*, [to the Pope] *was not made by our Reformers, or by any of their Friends or Favourers, but*

(*b*) *Just Vindication of the Church of* England *from Criminal Schism.* Ch. 3.

by

by their capital Enemies and Persecutors, by Zealots of the Roman Religion. And this was not done secretly in a Corner, but openly in the sight of the Sun, disputed publickly, and determined beforehand in both our Universities, which after long deliberation, and much disputation, done with all Diligence, Zeal, and Conscience, made this final Resolution and Profession. Tandem in hanc sententiam unanimiter convenimus ac concordes fuimus, videlicet, Romanum Episcopum, *&c.* 'That the *Roman* Bishop had no 'greater Jurisdiction, within the Kingdom of '*England*, conferr'd upon him by God in holy 'Scripture, than any other foreign Bishop. *After this, the same was voted and decreed in our National Synods; and lastly, after all this receiv'd and establish'd in full Parliament* [a Popish Parliament] *by the free Consent of all the Orders of the Kingdom, the Concurrence and Approbation of Four and Twenty Bishops, and Nine and Twenty Abbots, then and there present,* &c. He adds moreover, that these very Papists declar'd, That *the King, as Head of the Body Politick, consisting of Spirituality and Temporality, hath plenary Power to render final Justice for all Matters.* Now you see who they were that first gave this high Title to King *Henry* VIII. and by consequence how little concern we have in it.

And as to what you urge, of our Religion being brought in by King and Parliament, I own this we often hear of, but I would beg of you to tell me to what purpose? For is there any more fault in this, than in *Jehu*'s destroying *Baal* and his Worshippers? 2 *Kings* 10. 25, *&c.* or in *Hezekiah*'s banishing Idolatry out of *Judah*? 2 *Kings* 18. 4. And yet I hope you will not blame either of these for so doing. I am sure the one of them is highly commended for it in Scripture, in the two Verses next following that now refer'd to, in these words: *After him was none like him, among*

all the Kings of Judah, nor any that were before him. For he clave to the Lord, and departed not from following him, but kept his Commandments, which the Lord commanded Moses. And though the other is justly condemned for *worshipping the Golden Calves that were in* Bethel, *and that were in* Dan, *Ch.* 10. 29. yet because of his having in this respect, as well as in the destruction of the House of *Ahab, done well in executing what was right in the eyes of the Lord, and according to all that was in his heart*, therefore is he there promised, as a Reward of such his Service, that his *Children of the fourth generation should sit on the Throne of Israel.* Which is a sufficient Vindication of our Princes using the like Authority, when the Corruptions of your Communion were so many, and so gross, as to make it highly necessary. But to return to our own Nation. Did not Queen *Mary* usher in your Religion amongst us after the same manner that her Brother had cast it out? And did she not get it confirm'd by Act of Parliament, as he had done ours? And in the Reign of King *James* II. were not all Artifices used to get it brought back the same way? And were you not resolv'd to risk his Majesty and his Interest, to get it done, how dear soever himself might pay for it? As he found to his Cost. And have you not been irreconcileable to us ever since, because you could not get your Religion establish'd by Parliament? It is not the King, or Parliaments medling with Religion you dislike, but only their not appearing in behalf of yours. So that here again, your Charge against us rebounds home upon your selves.

SECT.

SECT. II.

R. C. HOwsoever that be, Mr. *L.* is highly to blame, that he *never tells his Reader, where Christ has placed the Spiritual Supremacy of his Church. Which in so great a Doctor was no small Sin of Omission.* (*a*)

C. E. Your Friend the *Restater* did not think an Omission of this Nature to be so unpardonable a Crime. When it was urged by Mr. *L.* (*b*) That *the Scriptures are silent* concerning the supposed universal Supremacy of S. *Peter*: *Must nothing*, says he, *be believ'd, but what is in Scripture?* (*c*) *Does the Scripture mention every place, where every Apostle preached the Gospel, or of which they were Bishops?* So F. *Maimbourg* (*d*) argues after the same manner, *Hath he* [*S.* Luke] *mention'd there any thing of S.* Paul's *Journey into* Arabia, *of his Return to* Damascus, *and then three Years after to* Jerusalem, *of his Travels into* Galatia, *his being ravish'd up into Heaven, his eight Scourgings, and a thousand things else that he suffer'd?* With such trifling Fallacies are great Men sometimes tempted to take up, when engaged in a Cause that is not otherwise to be maintained. But what sort of Parity is there in these Cases? Are all Christians equally concern'd in every Journy S. *Paul* took, or to know every Place where He or any other of the Apostles preached, or how long any of them stay'd there, as in the only Supreme Governour of the Church, to whom every one is bound to submit upon pain of Damnation? These Cases are so extremely different, that though a Christian may be safely ignorant of the former, it is against common

(*a*) p. 7. (*b*) *Case Stated*, p. 4. (*c*) *Case Restated*, p. 8. (*d*) *Prerogatives of the Church of* Rome *and her Bishops*, Ch. 2. p. 16.

Sense to think the other should have been passed over in silence, had it been more than a meer Chimera. But to let this pass; I will endeavour to make amends for Mr. *L*'s Omission, by shewing *where Christ has placed the Spiritual Supremacy of his Church.* And I think it is very plain from Scripture, that he has reserv'd it to himself, otherwise it will be hard to make Sense of what the Apostle says, *Ephes.* 1. 22, 23. especially as read in your Vulgar Translation, *Ipsum dedit caput super omnem Ecclesiam, quæ est corpus ipsius, & plenitudo ejus, qui omnia in omnibus adimpletur* (instead of *implet*). *He gave him the Head over all the Church, which is his Body, and his Fulness, who filleth,* or according to your Translation, "Who is fill'd" *all in all.* Now if Christ be the Head of the Church, and the Church his Body, as the Apostle expresly affirms, there is no difficulty in concluding where the Scripture places the Spiritual Supremacy. It must necessarily be in Christ the Head of that Body. The same Truth is taught again with no less plainness, *Col.* 1. 18. *He is the Head of the Body the Church.* Or if you would enquire for the Power next under his, and who has the chief Command over the Church after him, you need not be told, that the College of the Apostles were all Commission'd, S. *Matt.* 28. 19. to *go and make Disciples of all Nations,* &c. and that they were all equally sent forth, had the Holy Spirit conferred upon them all alike, and had all the same Power given them, of Absolving and Retaining Sins. For so we read, S. *John* 20. 21, 22, 23. *As my Father sent me, even so send I you. And when he,* our Lord Jesus Christ, *had said this, he breathed on them,* not on S. *Peter alone,* but indiscriminately on them all, *and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosesoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever Sins ye retain,*

they

they are retained. To these therefore, and their Successors the Bishops, was committed the Authority over the Church, next under Christ, the Supream Head of it. Their Commission was general, one and the same to all of them, and so must their Authority likewise be. So that notwithstanding what our Saviour commanded S. *Peter*, about feeding his Lambs and his Sheep, or the Promise made, That *upon this Rock will I build my Church*, though we suppose it to be built upon himself, as the *Vindicator* has shewn (*a*) before in what Sense it may be said to be so, yet had St. *Cyprian* good reason for his Assertion, that (*b*) *That*, or the same thing, *were the other Apostles, which* Peter *was, endued with the same share of Honour and Power, but the beginning proceeds from one, that so the Church may be shewn to be one.* And as the Apostles had the Supremacy contended for in common amongst them, so had their Successors the Colledge of Bishops, and each Bishop in his own Diocese, till for the better Order's sake, and the better Government of the Church, it was judged proper, by a common Consent, to raise some above their Brethren, with an Archiepiscopal, and Metropolitical, and others over them with a Patriarchal Title and Power. For as to their Original Power, it descended alike upon them all; and (*c*) the Pope at first claimed no more Power over his Fellow Bishops, than

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 19.

(*b*) Hoc erant utiq; & cæteri Apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi & honoris & potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut Ecclesia una monstretur. *De Unitat Eccl.* p. 107. Edit. Oxon.

(*c*) *Dr.* Featly, *in a little Volume, entituled*, Pedum Pastorale, p. 40. *speaking of the Pope, testifies, that by the Concession of one of their own Popes*, [Pius II. *Epist.* 288. Ad quem ante Concilium Nicenum parvus habebatur respectus] *very little regard was had to him before the Council of Nice.*

they

they did over him; that is none at all. As has been proved over and over, and you will never be able to disprove it.

R. C. I must confess the History of the New Testament *is very barren, as to Facts relating to the* Spiritual Jurisdiction *of the* Laity *over* Bishops.

C. E. Not more than it is as to Facts relating to S. *Peter*'s Superiority over the other Apostles; as you cannot but know very well. Be pleased therefore to remember this, and to add to it a Concession of your own, in the same Page, that (*a*) *Whatever Right is got by Custom, and the Laws of the Church, may also be recalled by it, and brought back to the first Institution*; and our casting off the Usurpations of the See of *Rome*, will not appear so criminal as those of your Party always endeavour to represent it. For you your self in the same place acknowledge, That *if Bishops*, as well as Kings, *are tempted to carry their Claims higher, than either Justice or Conscience will allow*, and *if in this Case they demand our Concurrence*, **We ought to obey God, rather than Men**, Acts 5. 29. Which being your own Doctrine, I hope the Truth and Efficacy of it will not be disputed, though alledged on our side.

R. C. As to the Pope, Mr. L. treats him as civilly, as the Rabble does, when they follow him and the Pretender to the Bonfire, p. 6.

C. E. But since you cannot, for otherwise I suppose you would, tell us, wherein this sort of ill Treatment consists, you cannot expect that I should have any thing to say to it.

R. C. If Mr. L. had intended to dispute seriously, he would not have measured the Pope's Authority, either by the Practice, or the Pretensions of some of his Predecessors, but only by what the Catholick Church allows, to be his due, Jure Divino, *p.* 7.

(*a*) *Page* 7.

C. E. He

C. E. He tells you plainly, (*a*) *the Supremacy he* [the Pope] *claims, is no less than an absolute Sovereignty over all the Churches and Kingdoms of the Earth, their Bishops and their Kings: and this not by any Ecclesiastical Constitution, or Grant of Temporal Princes, which might be conditional limited and revocable; and would infer their Superiority to him: but by a divine and indefeasible Right, as Successor of St.* Peter, *and Heir of all the Promises made to him, unalterable, unlimitable, and unaccountable to any Power upon Earth,* p. 9. And you do not deny that your Popes ordinarily claim all this; and that a great part at least of those of your Communion, own and plead for it. His Spiritual Power I suppose you will admit to be less disputable; and of his claim of an absolute Temporal Supremacy the Vindicator (*b*) has given divers Instances, which you have found it too hard to make a Reply to.

R. C. Mr. *L. takes it for granted, that the Pope is an universal Bishop, and an universal Monarch,* p. 8.

C. E. By no means; but only that he vainly pretends to be so.

R. C. But that is a great Mistake, for the Pope does not pretend to it: *These are Titles which he does not claim.*

C. R. If you could make that out, it would go a great way towards silencing the Differences that are on foot between us. But you may as well attempt to wash a Blackmoor white.

R. C. By an Universal Bishop, we mean him to whom all other Bishops are Vicars. Ibid.

C. E. And I am sure, whosoever reads the Speeches of *Laynez* General of the *Jesuits*, the *Legates*, and some others in the Council of *Trent*, would be strongly tempted to believe this to be what the *Pope* most earnestly desir'd to have had

(*a*) *Case stated*, p 82. (*b*) *Case truly stated*, p. 11.

decided

decided in his Favour; which made his Agents there so eager for it. Nor will you ever prevail with his Holiness to renouce this high Claim, or to thank you for your making so free with him, as to renounce it for him. Thus as to his Spiritual Claim; and then as to his Temporal, I have just now put you in mind of your not being able to answer the Pleas brought for it by the *Vindicator*; not to mention the many more that are commonly to be met with amongst your Writers.

R. C. *Some would have it thought a considerable Grievance, that Bishops at their Ordination take an Oath of Fidelity to the* Pope, *p.* 12.

C. E. And must it not be a great Grievance to Princes to have their Bishops swear to the Pope against themselves? It is certain they (*a*) oblige themselves inviolably to the Pope, and without any *Salvo* for their Prince, and the Duty and Obedience they owe to him; who has therefore no reason to look upon them thenceforward as his faithful and loyal Subjects.

R. C. But this and the like *being introduced by Custom*, if liable to just Exceptions, may be reform'd. *Ibid.*

C. E. And will you do me the Favour to let me know, what one Pope since the use of this Oath, the Pall, *&c.* ever to this Day, shew'd the least Inclination to any material Reformation, in this or any other kind. This you cannot do; and yet here you speak of it, as if it were what would readily be complied with: Though in your Conscience you know the contrary. However, I doubt if any thing of this Nature were propounded, you would be tempted to object, as you say here concerning the *Memorial* heretofore drawn up in *Germany*, that *what the Reformers*

(*a*) Pontifical. Rom. de consecrat. Electi in Episc.

aimed

aim'd at, was not Unity, *but* Schism: *Not to correct the Abuses of a* Court, *but to subvert the Faith of the* Catholick Church, *p.* 14.

R. C. It is to me a matter of no small Surprize, that some of those that inveigh most bitterly against the Pope's Supremacy, should yet maintain, that the Jurisdiction of every Bishop whatsoever reaches over the whole Church. This seems to be the Opinion of Mr. L's. Vindicator, *p.* 33. *which he endeavours to back with the Authority of St.* Chrysostom, p. 14.

C. E. And is it not for this that you take occasion immediately after, to quote Mr. *Stevens* as on your side? Does he not say, as there cited by you, *There is an Authority which every Bishop has throughout the whole Catholick Church*? And do you not argue from hence, in behalf of the Pope's universal Authority? And yet you think fit to quarrel with Dr. *Barrow* and the *Vindicator*; for saying what you approve of in him. But your Head, I find, was so full of that abominably infamous Fiction of the *Nags head* Ordination, though against all Sense and Reason, and very good (*a*) Authority to the contrary, that it is no great wonder if you forget your self.

R. C. I tell you *the Vindicator endeavours to back his Opinion with the Authority of* St. *Chrysostom.*

C. E. Very right: He shews St. *Chrysostom* is plainly on his side; and challenges you to confute both St. *Chrysostom* and St. *Paul.* But they are both so directly against you, that you thought it the wisest way to pass them by; and so stand still indebted for an Answer to them, and are like to do so. But I shall not throw your Objection aside, as you did the *Vindicators*, when thus powerfully backed.

R. C. What is it then you have to offer?

(*a*) See Mas. de Minist. Eccl. Angl. c. 8.

C. E. That every Bishop as such, is to have a concern for the whole Church, so as to be ready to serve any part of it, as there shall be Need and Opportunity; for instance, to ordain other Bishops where they are wanting and cannot otherwise be had, as (*a*) *Eusebius* of *Samosata* did in *Syria*, *Phænicia* and *Palestine*, during the *Arian* Persecution under the Emperor *Valens*, or to assist a sick Bishop in Ordaining, Confirming, or any other Office, *&c.* must necessarily be meant, not only by the Passages of St. *Chrysostom*, in the 33d Page of the *Case truly stated*; but St. *Cyprian's* Doctrine likewise teaching that (*b*) *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. There is one Episcopate, of which each Bishop possesses a part, yet so as to have an Interest in the whole.* What sort of Jurisdiction you take to be implied in this I cannot tell: But I am sure, if the *Roman* Pontif would claim no more, than either of these Fathers speak of, all our Contests about an universal Supremacy would immediately be at an End.

R. C. St. *Augustine*, St. *Jerome* and St. *Cyprian*, all declare for *the Chair of St.* Peter, as the *Rock* on which the Church is built, and the only Principle of Unity, p. 15, 16.

C. E. Upon this you glory very triumphantly, as if Dr. *Barrow*, and every other Opponent must fall before you: as though only three Authorities, had they been as plainly on your side, as you would have them, would have been sufficient to out-weigh that large Cloud of Witnesses the Dr. has brought against you, with these same three amongst the rest. But when all is done, here is no such mighty Business in these three Citations: For let us see what you can make of them.

(*a*) Theodoret H. E. l. 4. c. 12. (*b*) De Unit. Eccle. p. 108. Ed. Oxon.

As

As for St. *Augustine*, he professes indeed that he was kept in the Church by a Succession of Bishops down from St. *Peter*; in the Discourse you refer to, but it is in the *4th*, not as you say in the *5th* Chapter. There he reckons up several Causes of his adherence to the Catholicks, in Opposition to the *Manichees*, namely *the Consent of People and Nations, an Authority begun by Miracles, nourished by Hope, encreased by Charity, confirm'd by Humility, a Succession from the Seat of St.* Peter *down to the Pope that then was, and lastly the Name of Catholick, which none of the Hereticks, though fond enough of it, would so appropriate to themselves, as to shew their own Temple or House, to any that should enquire where they might go to a Catholick Church.* And here I suppose you will not say, is any Proof of St. *Peter's* universal Supremacy, much less of the Pope's. But it may be your Dependance is upon the other Words hitherto omitted; *cui pascendas oves suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit*, to whom our Lord after his Resurrection commended his Sheep to be fed. Yet you cannot say St. *Peter* could not either feed or govern our Lord's Sheep, as the other Apostles did, without an universal Jurisdiction; which it is not pretended that any of them had. St. *Peter* was to be the first Preacher of the Gospel, and to have an Authority or Jurisdiction over those he converted, as the rest of the Apostles had also over their Converts; or upon occasion in other parts of the Church, but you may study till Dooms-Day, before you can evince St. *Augustine* to have meant more than this by the Words here alledg'd.

The next is St. *Jerome*, who writing to Pope *Damasus* says, *I am join'd in Communion with your Holiness, that is with the Chair of* Peter; *upon that Rock I know the Church is built: whosoever eats the Lamb out of this House is profane; whosoever gathers*

not with thee scatters. And which of these words are they that prove St. Peter's universal Jurisdiction? Sure not the first, *I am join'd in Communion with your Holiness*, that is, *with the Chair of* Peter: For these can signify no more than that he acknowledg'd the Pope to be St. Peter's Successor, and held Communion with him as a lawful, Orthodox, Catholick Bishop, and if you will, one of a principal Station in the Church. Your own Cardinal *Cusanus* (a) tells you, as the *Vindicator* (b) has observed from an Author of your own, whom because he is against you in this, and some other of your Errors and Corruptions, you profess to disown, (c) though for no other Reason that I can learn: The Cardinal I say tells you, That *as we read that the three first Patriarchs of* Rome, Alexandria *and* Antioch, *sate in St.* Peter's *Chair*; (d) *so likewise did all the Bishops subject to them*; yet I hope these had not each of them an universal Supremacy. Next follows, *upon that Rock I know the Church is built.* Which Words would seem most naturally to imply that the Church was built upon St. Peter's Chair: but I suppose you will not admit of that, because it is the constant Plea of your Party, that St. Peter himself was the Rock, and upon his Person, not his Chair, the Church was built. Against this I have shewn that many of the Fathers declare, professing not St. Peter himself, but his Faith and Profession to be the Rock. But nevertheless, admitting St. Peter to be the Rock, the *Vindicator* has shewn you, in what sense

(a) De Concord, Cath. l. 1. c. 14. (b) *Case truly stated*, p. 42. (c) *The Author of our* English *Translation affirms, and quotes his Authority for it, that this Treatise was reprinted by the Order of the Arch-bishop of* Tholouse. *And so I am afraid his Grace must come likewise under the same Condemnation.* (d) P. 19.

the

the Church was really built upon him, and how little its being so built serves your Purpose. And you have not ventur'd to undertake a Disproof of him in that Point, though of principal Consequence in our present Debate. As neither have you attempted to answer those several Authorities brought by him (a) to shew, that St. *Peter* was not thought to be indeed the Rock spoken of in the Text. Hitherto therefore I cannot see how the Papal Pretences can be supported by this place of the Father. As neither can they from the following Words, *Whosoever eats the Lamb out of this House is profane; whosoever gathers not with thee scatters*; this being no more than might be said to any other right orthodox Bishop, and more especially to a truly Christian Patriarch, such as *Damasus* is suppos'd to have been. From such an one a man cannot separate himself without the guilt of Schism or Heresy, or both; and if he did, he might very well be term'd *a Scatterer* and *Profane*. But what proof is this of the Supremacy so zealously contended for, and which you boast to have been so fully clear'd by these three Fathers: I can discover nothing of it yet; yet I hope these had not each of them an universal Supremacy. Let us see therefore what your only remaining Voucher says for it. St. *Cyprian*'s Words are these; *They dare cross the Seas and carry Letters from their Faction, to the Chair of* Peter, *and the principal Church from which the Unity of the Priesthood is risen.* These are the Words in your own Translation, but I doubt they will prove indifferent Evidence for what you would extort from them. *The Chair of St.* Peter can never prove the Pope, or even St. *Peter* himself, to have had an universal Supremacy: *the principal Church*, that is

(a) P. 17, 18.

says

says *Rigaltius*, *in urbe principali constitutam*, which was settled in the principal City *Rome*, the Seat of the Empire, and most famous Capital of the World; which had (*a*) *potentiorem principalitatem*, a more eminent Principality, and was accordingly stil'd (*b*) *caput Orbis*, the Head of the World, (*c*) ἡ τοῦ παντὸς κεφαλὴ ἡ τῶν Ῥωμαίων βασιλὶς πόλις, *the Imperial City of* Rome, *the Head of the Universe*, (*d*) *quæ principatum & caput obtineat nationum*, which has acquir'd the Pre-heminence and Headship of the Nations. And being the Seat of the *Emperor*, and by consequence there being a great Confluence thither from all parts of his Dominions, and sometimes of Strangers too, no wonder that a peculiar regard was shewn to the Bishop there, but this will never prove an universal Supremacy to have been annext to that See by our Blessed Saviour; which is what you pretend to. That which looks most favourably on your side, is in the remaining Words, *Unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*, whence the Unity of Priesthood had its Rise. And yet to this *Polydore Virgil* answer'd long since, (*e*) that *the Order of Priesthood can no other way be said to have arisen from the Bishop of* Rome, *but as understood of* Italy *only*; and gives this substantial Reason for his Opinion, that *the Priesthood was duly instituted at* Jerusalem, *several Years before St.* Peter *came to* Rome. For it is plain, that if the Order of Priesthood had its Rise before St. *Peter* ever saw *Rome*, it could not possibly be first deriv'd from him, or any of his Successors there. He could not be the first Institutor of it in that Place, if it was really instituted in another several Years before he came

(*a*) Iren. c. hær. l. 3. c. 3. (*b*) Vinc. Lirin. Commonit. par. 2. p. 366. (*c*) Euseb. de vit. Constant. l. 1. c. 26. (*d*) Max. Taurin. Hom 5. in natali B. Petri & Pauli. (*e*) De rerum invent. l. 4. c. 6.

thither;

thither: Nor could its Unity be properly said to begin from thence, in any other than *Virgil*'s Sense, unless you will suppose it from its first Institution to have been all along without Unity till St. *Peter* came to *Rome*. This I take to be very plain.

R. C. But might not St. *Peter* bring this Unity with him from *Antioch*, where he had his Chair for some Years before he came to *Rome*?

C. E. That he did so is *gratis dictum*, nor can you ever prove it: and besides there are two other Objections that you can never get over. For 1*st*, St. *Cyprian* says not a Word of *Antioch*, or any Privilege brought from thence. And 2*dly*, if he had, the same Difficulty would recur that was urg'd in relation to *Rome*; namely, that if the *Unity of the Priesthood* arose from St. *Peter*'s Chair at *Antioch*, then could there be no such Unity amongst the Clergy till his Chair was settled there: which though not for so long a time, as if it had not arisen till his removal to *Rome*, is equally absurd to be suppos'd for its time.

R. C. It seems then you question St. *Cyprian*'s Testimony.

C. E. No, but I have shewn you, that I have good Reason to question your Sense of his Words, since it is what they cannot in Reason bear.

R. C. Methinks these few Quotations are sufficient to answer Dr. Barrow's *whole Discourse of* 428 *Pages, and shew with what Spirit Mr.* Tillotson *was directed when he told his credulous Reader, that the* Pope's *Supremacy was not only an indefensible, but an impudent Cause*, p. 16.

R. C. I hope your Courage will begin to abate, and you will see cause to alter your Opinion, when you find that as your Witnesses hitherto produc'd are very few, and in no-

wise

wise to compare with Dr. Barrow's large and learn'd Collection, so upon Examination it appears, that not one of those very few speaks home to the Point; and by consequence no impartial Jury but upon a fair Hearing, must inevitably give their Verdict against you; especially if it shall be farther consider'd: that these three Fathers bear apparent Evidence against you, as I shall briefly observe in these following Instances.

As to the first of them, St. *Augustine* declares, *That* (a) *amongst them all* Peter *sustains the Person of the Catholick Church; for to this Church are the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven given: And when it is said to him, it is said to all; lovest thou me, feed my Sheep.* Which does not look as if St. *Augustine* any way apprehended our Saviour to have given St. *Peter* a Supremacy over all by these Words, but only St. *Peter* being chosen to represent the Church, these Words were directed to him in particular as such, but with a Design to be applied to all the other Pastors of the Church wheresoever plac'd, or howsoever dispers'd. And again, (b) *Si in Petro non esset Ecclesiæ sacramentum, &c. If in* Peter *there was not a mystical Representation of the Church, the Lord would not say to him, I will give to thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed also in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven: if this is said only to* Peter, *it is not the Church that does this. But if it be effected in the Church, that what things are bound on Earth, are also bound in Heaven, and what things are loosed on Earth, are loosed in Heaven; because when the Church Excommunicates, the Excommunicate is bound in Heaven; when he is reconcil'd by the Church, being*

(a) De agone Christi. c. 30.

(b) In Evang. Joan. tractat. 50.

reconcil'd

reconciled he is loosed in Heaven; if therefore this is done in the Church, Peter *when he receiv'd the Keys, signified the Church.* The natural and inevitable Consequence of which Position is, that according to St. *Augustine, Peter* receiv'd the Keys, not for himself, but, as Proxy for or Representative of the Church. And so he could not have an universal Supremacy convey'd upon him for himself, by what was only entrusted with him in behalf of the Church, whose Representative he was.

In the next place, St. *Jerome* speaking of the two Sons of *Zebedee*, says, (a) John *and* James, *because they ask'd more than the others, had not their Petition granted them; and yet their Dignity was not lessened, for they were equal to the rest of the Apostles.* To the rest, it may be Mr. *A.* will say, except St. *Peter*; but he must needs see St. *Jerome* no more excepts this Apostle than any of the others; for it is plain he excepts none.

The last is St. *Cyprian*, and he is very express against the *Romanists* high Pretences for St. *Peter*: his Words are these, (b) *The same were the other Apostles that St.* Peter *was, endued with the same Partnership both of Honour and Power.* Which is as full a Declaration on our side, as Words can be: Nevertheless I must not omit to add at the same time, least I should be *pen'd in*, as the poor *Vindicatur* was, on all Sides, p. 123. that St. *Cyprian* tells us farther; *but the Beginning proceeds from one,* (as much as to say One, that is St. *Peter*, was to have the Honour of being the first Preacher of the Gospel amongst both *Jews* and *Gentiles*,) *that the Church may be shewn to be one.* Of what advantage these Words will be to your Cause I know not, but I am sure the former are as much to mine, as any I could desire. In like manner when he had just

(a) L. 2. in Jovin. c. 12. (b) De unit. Eccle.

 before

before said, *Though he gives to all the Apostles a like or equal Power*, parem potestatem, *and says, as my Father sent me, so also send I you*, &c. notwithstanding that he adds, in the same manner as in the foregoing Words, *That he might manifest Unity, by his Authority he ordaïn'd the original of this Unity beginning from one*; yet how you will make these words to confer upon St. *Peter* an universal Supremacy, is past my Conception. But this I am sure of, that you cannot so much as attempt it, without attempting at the same time to make St. *Cyprian* manifestly contradict himself in one and the same Breath; which I persuade my self will not be thought a justifiable Undertaking.

And thus I think I have sufficiently vindicated Dr. *Barrow* as to any thing he might fear from these three Fathers, and have shewn that they are so far from *answering his whole Discourse of* 428 *Pages*, that they do not answer any one Page of it, and that it still *highly deserves to be translated into other Languages, for the benefit of Foreigners*, notwithstanding all your useless Efforts against it. I may add also, that Mr. *Tillotson*'s Charge, as you call him, stands for ought I can see, still as firm against you as ever.

For a Conclusion therefore of this Section, I only say, That if St. *Augustine*, St. *Jerome*, and St. *Cyprian* must needs *fight it out*, as you would have them, it must not be with Dr. *Barrow*, for they are all of his side, but with your self who Subpœna'd them in through pure Mistake.

SECT. III.

R. C. MR. *L*'s Vindicator, and *Dr.* Barrow *before him, are very positive that* St. Peter's *Supremacy cannot be concluded from our Saviour's threefold*

threefold Command to that Apostle, to feed *his* Lambs and *his* Sheep, St. *Joh.* 21. 15, 16, 17. *p.* 17.

C. E. And indeed who would not be very positive in so very plain a Case? Here is a Conclusion of the weightiest Consequence, drawn from such Premises, as are no manner of Proof of it. But let us see how you frame your Argument from them.

R. C. If Christ did not design to give St. Peter *any more Power than to the other Apostles over his Flock, why did he say to him,* lovest thou me more than these? p. 18.

C. E. Now suppose I could not tell why our Saviour put this Question to St. *Peter*, would my Ignorance prove his Supremacy? I cannot think you will pretend this. But I must confess I see no Difficulty in giving a Reason, for the Question here put by our Blessed Lord. St. *Peter* had professd a peculiar Zeal and Affection for our Blessed Saviour above the rest of the Apostles, insomuch that *though all Men should be offended because of him, yet he would never be offended*, St. Mat. 26. 33. *nay, though he should die with him, yet he would not deny him*; v. 35. Now whether it were only to put him in mind of his former Profession of a singular Love to our Saviour, and so make him the more diligent upon that account; or to humble him under a Sense of his dreadful Fall, consequent hereupon as St. *Ambrose* (*a*) seems to suppose, and thus to quicken his Care, and excite his Zeal by the Remembrance of his past Miscarriage; either of these is a much better ground of the Question put to St. *Peter*, than that of his universal Supremacy; and for this plain reason that such a Profession

(*a*) Qui enim Dominum tertio negaverat, tertio confitetur, & quotiens culpam delinquendo contraxerat, totiens gratiam diligendo conquirit. S. *Ambr.* Serm. 48.

was certainly made, and such a Failure happen'd upon it, but there is no certainty that such a Supremacy was ever granted, but very good Evidence against it. And indeed who would not be exceedingly surpriz'd to hear so mighty, supereminent a Privilege rais'd upon so strangely slight a Foundation as this Question of our Lord; *Lovest thou me more than these?* in which is no Grant at all, much less a Grant of such excessive Importance as this pretended Supremacy would be.

R. C. *Again, if he did not give him the Pastoral Care of all his Sheep, how came he to express his Commission three times over in an unlimited Form?* Ibid.

C. E. You have already been told, (a) that *it was the necessary Duty of all the Apostles during their time, and of their Successors in all following Generations, to feed our Saviour's Lambs and Sheep; and if St.* Peter *was requir'd to do the same, this implies no more Jurisdiction in him, than in the other Apostles, on each of whom this Duty was no less incumbent than on him.* And it is easier to ask the same Question over again, than to shew the Deficiency of the Answer to it. For which reason you are pleas'd to take no notice of that. And if the Command here given were deliver'd three times over, you have been told likewise, (b) *that if the Words themselves do not convey any such paramount Jurisdiction, the Repetition of them can never do it.* Which is a great Truth; and you do not deny it, but only put the Question again, as if nothing had been said to it. Nor indeed had such a Repetition been at all necessary, for conveying any sort of Privilege; it being sufficient that such Privilege be once granted in plain Terms, which this you see is not. But supposing the Words to be spoken

(a) *Case stated*, p. 21. (b) P. 22.

with

with a Design to remind the Apostle of his Fall, and excite him to a greater Care and Stability for the future, nothing could be more proper, than to press and inculcate the Obligation that lay upon him. And 'tis very strange therefore, that this so plain a Reason of the Question, the Command and the Repetition of it, must be rejected, purely to make way for a Pretence of a different nature, that has no reason at all in it. But when a Cause is to be maintain'd, something must be said for it, whether to the purpose or not.

R. C. These Words, Feed my Sheep, and strengthen thy Brethren, *seem to import the Exercise of the very same Office, and without any Restrictions*, p. 19.

C. E. I should be very glad to learn by what sort of Construction, *strengthen thy Brethren*, can possibly denote a Commission to rule over the whole Church of Christ, it being a Command that might as well be given to any one in a lower Station, as to an Apostle. And yet if this does not import such a superlative Power and Prehéminence, as it most certainly does not, nor can; then by your own Confession neither do those other Words, *Feed my Sheep*: since you make them equivalent Terms, and which, to use your own Expression, *seem to import the Exercise of the very same Office.*

R. C. *I am inclined to think, if any one of these Gentlemen, that will not grant this to be good* Evidence, *had a Legacy left to him in these Terms*: Item, I leave my Sheep to Mr.——*he would be tempted to put in his Claim to the whole Flock.*

C. E. I grant it. But I beseech you, good Sir, is it the same thing to say in a Will, *I give my Sheep to* Mr——and to say to a Servant, *Take care to feed my Sheep after I am dead, as well as in the mean time.* If that Servant should thence put in a

Claim

Claim to those Sheep, as bequeathed to him by those Words spoken to him, he may carry his Suit for them through all the Courts in the Nation, and meet every where with the same Sentence, that here is no Bequest to found such a Right upon. For he will be so far from having a Propriety in them all, that he will not have it in any one of them. Be pleas'd to apply this, and make the best use you can of it. And yet again, if it were suppos'd, though against all Sense and Reason, that these Words did convey a full Power to the Apostle over all the *Sheep* committed to his Care; how will it hence follow that this was to be at first, and since to continue to all Ages, over the whole Church of Christ? Might it not possibly be restrain'd to the *Jews*, who were in a peculiar manner stil'd in Scripture God's (*a*) *Sheep*. And though the *Gentiles* are call'd his Sheep also, as being design'd to be brought into his Fold, yet there is a plain Distinction put between them, (*b*) *other Sheep I have, which are not of this Fold* [of the Jews,] *these must I bring also, that they may be one Fold, and one Shepherd.* Accordingly our Lord tells us (*c*) *He was not sent, save to the lost Sheep of the House of* Israel. Now it is own'd by all that St. *Peter* was in a particular manner the Apostle (*d*) of the *Jews*, (*e*) the Apostle of the Circumcision; and why therefore might not these be the *Sheep* he was here Commission'd to feed? I do not see why the Words may not bear this Sense; and if they may, your universal Supremacy is quite out of Doors.

R. C. See how St. *Gregory* in his Letter to the Emperor *Mauritius* understood this Text. *His*

(*a*) St. *Mat.* 10, 6. & 15, 24. (*b*) St. *Joh.* 10. 16. (*c*) St. *Math.* 15. 24. (*d*) *Rom.* 15. 8. (*e*) *Gal.* 2. 8, 9.

words

words are extreamly remarkable: It is evident, says he, to all that know the Gospel, that the Care of the whole Church was, by our Lord's Voice, committed to the Apostle St. *Peter*, Prince of all the Apostles. For to him it is said, *Peter, loveſt thou me? Feed my Sheep*: and a little after, *behold*, says he, *the Care and Primacy* [or Supremacy] *of the whole Church is committed to him.* Ibid.

C. E. Be it so that a Pope, out of his forward Zeal for the *Roman Supremacy*, endeavour'd to settle St. *Peter* above the rest of the Apostles, this might shew the Power of Prejudice and Interest, even in a better Man than those who have succeeded him since; but will never prove that St. *Peter* had a Superiority over the other Apostles, or that the Popes have it over all other Bishops and Christians. And yet after all, what is there so *remarkable* in what this Pope says?

1st, He calls St. *Peter* Prince of all the Apostles; and if this Title be given him, as the first and chief of them, I see no great matter in it. And that this was the Sense in which it was usually given him, may easily be infer'd from what we find said of others of them by others of the Fathers, and even by this *Gregory* himself. For Instance, He tells us of the Apostle St. *Paul*, (*a*) that though he had been so great a Persecutor, yet upon his Conversion to Christianity, he was not only (*b*) *made the Head of the Nations*, but likewise that he (*c*) *obtain'd the Primacy* [or in your own Language, the Supremacy] *of the whole Church.* Now do these words testify the Supremacy over all the Church to have been in St. *Paul*? If not, neither will the same Description evidence it to

(*a*) In 1. Reg. c. 10. expos. l. 4. Fol. 2. p. 1469. Edit. Frob. (*b*) Caput effectus est nationum. (*c*) Obtinuit totius Ecclesiæ principatum.

have

have been in St. *Peter*. Yet you see it is in both places *Principatus*, Primacy or Principality, or in your Dialect *Supremacy*, which is by this Pope himself ascrib'd to both, and so must prove it to belong either to both or to neither; choose you which you please. You have also been told before, (*a*) that the Homily concerning *Peter* and *Paul*, whether (*b*) St. *Chrysostom*'s or not, seems to give the Preference to St. *Paul*, when he puts the Questions, *What is greater than* Peter? and presently after, *What is equal to* Paul? And at other times it is certain, St. *Chrysostom* teaches, that (*c*) οὐδεὶς Παύλῳ ἴσος, *no one is equal to St.* Paul, and calls him (*d*) *the Leader and President of the Choir of Saints*, (*e*) *the Oecumenical Apostle*, (*f*) *the Pillar of the Church, firmer than Iron and a Rock*, (*g*) *the Master*, or Teacher *of the World*, τῆς ὁ οἰκουμένης διδασκάλου; and affirms of him (*h*) that he *had the Care upon him, not of one House, but of Cities, and Countries and Nations, and even* (*i*) *of the whole World*; and again, that he *govern'd all the World*, (*k*) *as it had been a single House or Ship, being all at once, Sailor and Commander, and Boatswain, having upon him the burden of the Shrouds, and the Vessel and all things*: and as he is call'd (*l*) *the Head and President of the* Jews, so is he likewise (*m*) *the Preacher of the World*. And again, speaking of St. *Peter*, he tells us; (*n*) St. *Paul was equal in Honour to him*, (*to say no more at present*) and though he *came up to him as to a greater and elder Person, he came not to learn of him, or be corrected by him, but only to see him, and honour him*

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 14. (*b*) Tom. 5. p. 992. Edit. Æton. (*c*) In 2 *Tim.* 3. p. 267. (*d*) In *Rom.* 16. p. 240. (*e*) In 1 *Cor.* 9. 2. (*f*) In *Rom.* 1. 12. (*g*) In *Gen.* 11. p. 246. (*h*) In 2 *Cor.* 11. 28. (*i*) ὁλοκλήρου τῆς οἰκουμένης. (*k*) Ibid p. 681. (*l*) In 2 *Cor.* 10. 18. (*m*) In 1 *Cor.* 9. 20. (*n*) *Gal.* 1. 18.

with

with his presence. And again, *Moreover he* (*a*) *shews himself to be equal in Honour, and compares himself, not to the rest; but even to the chief of them, shewing, that each one was possessed of the same Dignity*; and again, (*b*) *When he was concerned to compare himself, he mentioned* Peter *only.* And once more, *Into his hands*; says the same Father, (*c*) *were committed the Earth, the Sea, and both the inhabited and uninhabited parts of the World.* Of such unlimited extent is this Apostle's Commission here declared to have been. And now what more could have been said of S. *Peter*, had he been possess'd of all that weighty Charge the *Romanists* profess our Saviour to have committed to him. Yet all this, and a great deal more, is ascrib'd by this eloquent Father to S. *Paul*, the last called of the Apostles. Who also professes of himself, 2 *Cor.* 12. 11. that he *was not behind the very chiefest Apostles.* Which yet it is not likely he would have said in such general terms, and without any sort of restriction, if he had known himself a Subject of S. *Peter*; And we may hence very well infer, he did not. Agreeably whereto the Title of the (*d*) Epistle to S. *James the Less*, attributed to *Clemens Romanus*, is directed in the like lofty manner of Expression. Κλήμης Ἰακώβῳ τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ἐπισκόπων ἐπισκόπῳ, &c. *Clement*, to *James* the Lord and Bishop of Bishops, Ruler over *Jerusalem*, the Holy Church of the *Hebrews*, καὶ τὰς πανταχοῦ θείᾳ προνοίᾳ ἱδρυθείσας, *and all that are any where settled by the Providence of God.* And again, he is called at another time, *Prince of the Bishops.* In like manner *Hesychius* a Presbyter, and afterwards

(*a*) In *Gal.* ii. 8. (*b*) In v. 9. (*c*) Παῦλος δὲ γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν, καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην, καὶ τὴν ἀοίκητον [ἐπεχειρίδη] Εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Ἀπος. Παῦλον, λογ. 6. T. 8. p. 39. (*d*) Cotelerius Patr. Apost. vol. 2.

Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, extols this same S. *James*, the first Bishop there, in a strain that would have been of singular use to the Advocates for the *Romish* Supremacy, had it been spoken of S. *Peter*, and ought as well to have its weight against them, when spoken on the other side. He stiles him (*a*) *The Servant and Brother of Christ, the Chieftain of the* New Jerusalem, *the Captain of the Priests, the Prince of the Apostles, the Top amongst the Heads, the brightest among the Lights, and most resplendent amongst the Stars*. The like glorious Titles he gives also to S. *Andrew*, calling him not only (*b*) the *Firstborn of the Choir of the Apostles, the first settled Pillar of the Church*, but likewise the *Peter* [or *Rock*] *that was before* Peter, *the Foundation of the Foundation*. In like manner, the foremention'd S. *Chrysostom*, speaking of the Apostle S. *John*, calls him not only (*c*) *the Son of Thunder, the beloved of Christ*, but also *the Pillar of the Churches throughout the World*, and teaches, that he *had the Keys of the Heavens*. And of the Apostles in general he affirms, (*d*) That they are *Princes ordained of God; Princes, not such as have received Nations and different Cities, but who all had the World committed to them in common*. From which, and other like Sayings of divers of the Fathers, concerning the other Apostles, as well as S. *Peter*, it is obvious to observe, upon how sandy a foundation the *Romanists* endeavour to erect the pretended Supremacy of that Apostle, when they argue for it from this sort of Rhetorical Expressi-

(*a*) Πᾶς ἐγκωμιάσω τὸν τῆς Χριστοῦ δοῦλον καὶ ἀδελφὸν, τὸν τῆς νέας Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀρχιστράτηγον, τὸν τῶν ἱερέων ἡγεμόνα, τῶν ἀποστόλων τὸν ἔξαρχον, τὸν ἐν κεφαλαῖς κορυφῶν, τὸν ἐν λύχνοις ὑπερλάμποντα, τὸν ἐν ἄστροις ὑπεροφαίνοντα; Phot. Bib. Cod. 275.

(*b*) Ὁ τῆς χορῆς τῶν Ἀποστόλων πρωτότοκος ὁ πρωτοπαγὴς τῆς ἐκκλησίας θεμέλιος, ὁ περὶ Πέτρῳ Πέτρος, ὁ τῆς θεμελίου θεμέλιος. Cod. 269.

(*c*) Hom. 1. in Evang. B. Joan.

(*d*) Περὶ τῆς χρήσ. ἡ τῶν γεγραφῶν ἀνάγν. To. 8. p. 115.

ons

ons concerning him, in these here cited, or others of the Fathers; and by consequence, that no great stress can be laid upon S. *Gregory*'s calling him, *The Prince of all the Apostles.* If I should say of *Homer*, that he was the Prince of the *Greek*, or of *Virgil*, that he was the Prince of the *Latin* Poets, or of *Tully*, that he was the Chief, or most Eminent, or Prince of the Orators, would not he be thought disorder'd in his head, that should undertake from hence, to infer, that they had a Supreme Authority over the rest of the Poets and Orators, and were to look upon them all, and treat them as their Subjects? S. *Jerom* stiles *Origen*, (*a*) *post Apostolos Ecclesiarum Magistrum*, the Master of the Churches next after the Apostles; and in *Theodoret* (*b*) S. *Chrysostom* is called ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος, yet I am well satisfied you will not affirm any Jurisdiction over the Churches, or the World, to be implied in either of these Titles. Instances of this nature are very common in all sorts of Writers.

R. C. He says, the Care and Primacy of the whole Church is committed to him.

C. E. And what is there in this that has not already receiv'd an Answer? For if it be said of S. *Paul*, that he was the Oecumenical Apostle, a firmer Pillar of the Church than Iron or Stone, that none was equal to him, that he had the Care and Burden of the whole World upon him, that he honoured *Peter* with his presence, and shewed that each of the Apostles was ἰσότιμος, equal in Honour or Dignity; if of St. *James*, that he was a Captain of the Priests, the Prince of the Apostles, the Top amongst the Heads, *&c.* of S. *Andrew*, that he was the *Peter* that was before *Peter*, the Foundation of the Foundation; of St. *John* that he was the Pillar of the Chur-

(*a*) Præfat. in lib. Nominum Hebr.
(*b*) Hist. Eccl. *l.* 5. *c.* 32.

ches throughout the World, and had the Keys of Heaven entrusted with him; and of all the Apostles, that God ordained them Princes, not of Cities and Nations, but of the whole World; what is there more in S. *Peter*'s being said to have the Care and Primacy of the whole World, than what these Sayings amount to? Especially if hereto we add the words of *Isidore* of *Sevil*, who teaches indeed, that *The Power of binding* (*a*) *and loosing was first given to St.* Peter, *and he first converted People to the Faith by the force of his Preaching*; but then immediately subjoins, that *Cæteri Apostoli cum Petro par consortium honoris & potestatis acceperunt*, the rest of the Apostles receiv'd an equal partnership of Honour and Power with *Peter*.

R. C. To him it was said, *Lovest thou me?*

C. E. It will be very strange, if these words invest him in a Supremacy over the Apostles, and the whole Church, or indeed in any Privilege at all.

R. C. But to him also it was said, *Feed my Sheep.*

C. E. S. *Augustin*, an ancienter Father than S. *Gregory*, tells you plainly, (*b*) *When it is said to* Peter, *it is said to all, Lovest thou me? Feed my Sheep.* That he had not any peculiar Priviledge or Authority committed to him, but, as was noted before, what was said was spoken to him, (*c*) as a *Representative of the whole Catholick Church*, to whom it belong'd. And hence infers, that the Catholick Church should readily pardon her penitent returning Children; since S. *Peter*, who stood as its Representative, was so easily forgiven the divers failures he had been guilty of. And at another time, (*d*) that Christ is the *one Shep-*

(*a*) De Eccles. Offic. *l.* 2 *c.* 5. (*b*) De agone Christi, *c.* 30. (*c*) Ecclesiæ Catholicæ personam sustinet Petrus. (*d*) Tractat. in Joan. 46.

herd

herd, and the *Bishops also are Shepherds, and yet he is the one Shepherd, because they are all Members of the one Shepherd, whose own the Sheep are*; without the least intimation of any one being above the rest, save only this one Shepherd and Lord of all. And according to S. *Bernard*, there can be no peculiar Priviledge or Preheminence given by this Commission, for he takes it to import only an Obligation to publish the glad Tidings of the Gospel. For so his words are (*a*) *Evangelizare pascere est. Fac opus Evangelistæ, & Pastoris opus implesti. To preach the Gospel, is to* Feed. *Do the Work of an Evangelist, and thou hast fulfill'd the Work of* the Pastor. Nor is it to be conceiv'd, that these words to St. *Peter* should be of any larger extent, or convey any other Power, than those spoken to all the other Apostles, no less than to S. *Peter*, S. *Matthew* 28. 19, 20. *All Power is given me in Heaven and upon Earth. Go ye therefore, and teach* [or make Disciples of, μαθητεύσατε] *all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the World. Amen.* So that upon the whole, I cannot see, how S. *Gregory*'s words can be any tolerable Proof of S. *Peter*'s, much less of the Pope's Supremacy over the whole Christian World; as you and your Friend would have it.

R. C. S. *Chrysostom*, you see, is directly against you.

C. E. If he speaks here in favour of S. *Peter*, as having the Care of the Flock committed to him; yet that he did not think it committed to him alone, or in a different manner than to the other

(*a*) De Consideraf. *l.* 4. *c.* 3.

Apostles,

Apostles, I have but now shewn from his having said as much for his Fellow Apostle S. *Paul*, which he could not have done, had he looked upon S. *Peter* as set over him by our Lord.

R. C. S. Eucherius, *Bishop of* Lions, *says, He was made not only a Shepherd, but the Shepherd of Shepherds, and had both the Sheep and the Lambs committed to him; besides which, there is nothing in the Church.* And S. Asterius *was a few Years later than him, and understood* S. John 21. 15. *after the same manner with him.* p. 21.

C. E. How *Asterius* came to be a few Years later than *Eucherius* I cannot understand, when according to all the accounts I have met with of him, he flourished, and as far as I have observed, died, above Thirty Years before him. But that I let pass, as of no concern in our present Controversy. It would be much more to our purpose to consider the Passages cited from both of them. But from this I must beg to be excused at present, not having those Authors by me; nor being able, upon all the search I can make, to meet with the Discourse appealed to of *Eucherius*, or with more than Five Sermons of *Asterius*; out of which Number it is impossible to fish an Eighth. For though I presume the Passages mentioned by you, to be rightly quoted, it is hard to make a Construction of them, without knowing something of what goes before, or follows them. All therefore I can now say of them is, that if the rest of the Authorities produced to the same purpose, will not prove S. *Peter*'s Supremacy, as you would have them, then neither will these; and for the rest, I think I have already, in a good measure, shewn that they will not.

R. C. In the third Century, S. Cyprian *says,* Christ speaks to *Peter*, I say unto thee, that thou

art

art *Peter*, and upon this Rock I will build my Church. And after his Resurrection, he says to him again, Feed my Sheep. *From these two Passages S.* Cyprian *draws two Conclusions. The first is*, Super unum ædificat Ecclesiam suam, Christ builds his Church upon one. *The second is, Ut Unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem, ab uno incipientem, suâ Auctoritate disposuit.* Christ, to shew the Unity of the Church, ordered, by his own Authority, that one Man should be the [Center or] the Original of that very Unity, p. 23.

C. E. First you say, *Super unum ædificat Ecclesiam suam*, he builds his Church upon one, meaning S. *Peter*. And hence you infer, that S. *Peter*, and not only He, but the Popes, down to our own time, were hereby made Princes, and the only Supreme Governours of the Church of Christ. A very far fetch'd Deduction! For, pray, good Sir, how comes this building of the Church upon that Apostle, necessarily to import a Supremacy in all his *Roman* Successors, of whom not a word is spoken, or even in himself! His laying the first Foundation of the Church, amongst both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, as the Vindicator (*a*) has shewn, and you must needs own he did, is a much more natural Interpretation of these words than that you would have put upon them. For it is much properer to say a Corporation or Society is built upon him who was the first Founder, or Beginner of it, than upon him who was only constituted the Chief Ruler of it. So that till you can prove yours to be the only just Interpretation of these words, which you will never be able to do, your Argument from them falls to the ground. And the

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 19, 20.

rather

rather, if you reflect a little upon what (*a*) I mentioned before from S. *Paul*, Eph. 2. 20. who tells the *Ephesians*, that they were *built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.* Where you see the Apostles are all said to have had the Church built upon them as Founders of it, no less than S. *Peter*, though he, it is confess'd, had the Honour to be the first beginner of it, and so to have it built upon him before the rest. Now, does it's being built upon each of them, prove that every one had a Supremacy over all the other Apostles. This you cannot pretend, and if not, it will be impossible ever to prove, that the same Expression will confer upon St. *Peter*, what it will by no means confer upon Them. Your other Observation is, That *Christ, to shew the Unity of the Church, ordered, by his own Authority, that one Man should be the Center, or Original of that very Unity.* Had the poor *Vindicator* render'd these words, as you have done, it troubles me to think, what a severe Rebuke he must have expected for his pains. It would certainly have been no less than a *Falsification*, a *Cast of his Art*, and a plain forfeiture of the Name of *Philalethes*. But I make no Recrimination; but only beg to know, upon what Authority you render *Originem*, *Center*, rather than *Beginning*, or first Foundation of that Unity? That S. *Peter*, who was but one, did after our Saviour, lay the first Foundation of the Church, is acknowledg'd on all Hands. That this was purposely ordered by our Saviour, says St. *Cyprian*, to shew its Unity as beginning from one, *Ab uno incipientem*; but how this shews S. *Peter* to have been then look'd upon, as the constant permanent Center of that Unity in all

(*a*) Ibid.

Ages

Ages, is not to be comprehended. And it is much easier for you to suppose, than to undertake the proof of it. Nor could any thing agree more exactly to my Sense of the Promise made to S. *Peter*, that upon him should the Church be built, as he laid the first foundation of it. For so it did certainly *ab uno incipere*, begin from one, which it would not have done, if this Apostle had been only the Supreme Governour, instead of being under Christ, the first Founder of it. Whence it follows, that S. *Cyprian*, as here quoted by your self, instead of being against me, is apparently on my side, and as express to my purpose as needs to be desired.

R. C. Pray observe what *Rufinus* quotes *Origen* for. *Cap.* vi. *p.* 639—— *Petro cum summa rerum de pascendis ovibus traderetur, & super ipsum, velut super Petram, fundaretur Ecclesia*; When *the chief Power* of feeding the Sheep was given to *Peter*, and the Church was built upon him as upon a Rock—— *p.* 22.

C. E. Will you admit *Origen* then to be an Evidence in the Case? I thought his Testimony, though allowed of by others, would by no means pass muster with you.

R. C. How came you to think so?

C. E. Because I find in your following Tract about *Transubstantiation*, it was judged requisite, that this same *Origen*, when produced against you, should be thrust from the Bench for an Heretick, and so no competent Witness for Mr. *L.* p. 191.

R. C. But here he is for us.

C. E. That indeed alters the Case. And if you please, he shall be heard. But pray, what would you infer from his Testimony?

R. C. First, That S. *Peter* had the *Chief Power* given to him, and then, that he is owned to be the Rock, on which the Church was built.

C. E. The latter of these Pleas I have just now considered, and have shewn, that this Priviledge of being *the Rock on which the Church* was built belongs to S. *Peter*, much more clearly, as he was the first Founder of the Church, which he undoubtedly was, than as supposed to be the Supreme Ruler of it, which he in truth was not. And this must stand for right, till you can prove the contrary; which will be long enough. As to the other, the *Cheif Power*, here said to be given him, that depends only upon a turn of your own Pen. For the words, as produced by your self, are *Summa rerum de pascendis ovibas*, The *Chief Power*, say you, *of Feeding the Sheep*. But another Man would say, and with greater reason; *The Principal Care*, or the Sum of the Business, *of Feeding the Sheep*. And what becomes then of your Authority from *Rufinus*? S. *Peter* had the First and Chief Care committed to him, as he was to be the First Builder of the Church; and I am much mistaken, if any more can be drawn out of these words. But now let us hear what *Origen* himself speaks, as to S. *Peter's* Supremacy, and see whether he owns any such Paramount Authority conferred upon him, by our Saviour's Promise of building his Church upon him (*a*) *Confessus est autem, Tu es Christus; quod nesciebant Judæi*, &c. *He confessed, Thou art the Christ: which the* Jews *did not know: And he did not only confess, Thou art the Christ; but what is more, The Son of the living God.* And a little after, *Blessed art thou* Simon *the Son of* Jonah, *for flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. And I say unto thee; Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. Perhaps*

(*a*) *Orig. in S.* Matt. 16. *Edit.* Jo. Exig.

if

if we also should say what Peter *said, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, not Flesh and Blood revealing it to us, but the Father who is in Heaven enlightning our Mind, we shall be* Peter, *and obtain the same Blessedness with him, by means of our Confession like his Confession. But then it is not Flesh and Blood that reveals to us Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of the living God, but the Father who is in Heaven; when our Conversation is in Heaven, and is worthy of the Revelation of our heavenly Father. If therefore we by the Revelation as we said of the Father, confessing Jesus to be the Christ the Son of the living God, (a) shall be made* Peter, *it shall in like manner be said to us by God the Word: Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church*, &c. Petra enim est omnis qui imitator est Christi: *For every one that is a Follower of Christ is a Rock.* From whence it is plain, that if *Origen* held *Peter* to be the Rock in your Sense, so as to be supream Governour of the Church, he at the same time shews you how we may all be so too; and then you will have such a multitude of Supremes, that his Supremacy will prove little worth.

R. C. Optatus Milevitanus stiles him truly Head of all the Apostles, *p.* 23.

C. E. And so he might be call'd without a Supremacy over them, if consider'd either as (*b*)

(*a*) Facti fuerimus Petrus.

(*b*) *St.* Chrysostom *says St.* Paul *went up to him, as to one that was elder*, In Gal. 1. 18. *And though* Baronius *pleads from* Epiphanius *that St.* Andrew *was elder than he, yet at the same time he acquaints us with a Passage of this sāme St.* Chrysostom, *cited by St.* Metaphrastes, *which expresly declares that* Peter *was the elder:* Posterior Petro in vitam ingressus est Andreas, *&c.* Martyrol. *in Nov.* 30. Ætati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat. *B. Hieron.* c. *Jovin.* l. 1. c. 17. Antecederet confessione, quia antecedebat ætate. Cassian. de Incarnat. Dom. l. 3. c. 12.

the eldest amongst them, or as the first call'd of them, as before I have done; I shall have occasion to shew he was. He might upon either of these accounts have some sort of Pre-heminence amongst the Apostles, and have a peculiar Title of Precedence, and yet be very far from a supreme Jurisdiction over the rest.

R. C. St. Chrysostom *stiles him the Head* of all the Apostolical Choir, *Ibid.*

C. E. So I have told you, he stiles St. *Paul* (*a*) the *Leader and President of the Choir of Saints*; and says there is (*b*) *none equal to him*; which bids as fair for an universal Supremacy as the other. As St. *Jerome* also calls him (*c*) *Magister Ecclesiæ*, the Master of the Church.

R. C. St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, St. *Epiphanius*, and St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, *call him the Prince and Ruler of the Apostles*, Ibid.

C. E. So you say. But first I must beg leave to tell you, the *Chief and Fore-man* or *Leader* of the Apostles they do indeed call him, but that they call him the *Prince and Ruler* of them, does not appear from any thing you have cited from them, as might so easily be shewn, that I persuade my self you will not attempt to maintain the contrary. Yet till you not only attempt, but effectually do it, they will none of them stand you in any stead. Whereto let me add, that *Maximus Taurinensis* speaking of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* stiles them both (*d*) without any manner of Distinction, *Gloriosissimos Christianæ fidei principes*, most glorious Princes of the Christian Faith; and again, (*e*) *Ecclesiarum omnium reverendissimos Patres*, the most Reverend Fathers of all the Churches;

(*a*) In *Rom.* 16. p. 240. (*b*) In 2 *Tim.* p. 367. (*c*) Con. Jovin. l. 1. c. 4. (*d*) Homil. 1. in Nat. B *Pet.* & Paul, p. 228, 229. (*e*) *As also they are called* Eccl. Principes Hom. 5. p. 231.

and

and says they were *tanquam Ecclesiarum omnium principes facti dispensatione cælesti*, made as *Princes* of all the Churches by a heavenly Dispensation; and of St. *Paul* alone it is said, that he was *Christiani nominis princeps futurus*, to be Prince of the Christian Name. And in the *4th* Homily upon these Saints he affirms of both, that they were (*a*) *Ecclesiarum columnæ*, the Pillars of the Churches. All which places I produce only to shew, that he puts no difference between them, but attributes the same Titles equally to them both; which was not to have been expected, if he had look'd upon the one of them as the Sovereign, and the other as his Subject. But in his (*b*) *5th* Homily upon these Apostles, which I take the Liberty to call his, rather than either St. *Ambrose's* or St. *Augustin's*, because Mr. *Du Pin* (*c*) affirms of this and divers others of them, that they are visibly this Bishop's; in this Homily I say, he teaches that *Peter* and *Paul* have a Pre-heminence amongst all the Apostles, and excel them by a certain peculiar Prerogative; and in such a manner that it is not certain whether of them has a right to the Preference. *Petrus & Paulus eminent inter universos Apostolos & peculiari quadam prærogativâ præcellunt. Verum inter ipsos quis cui præponatur incertum est.* Thus *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* terms them *the* (*d*) *Provosts* or Presidents *of the Church*, Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος ... οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προστάται. And thus Dr. *Barrow* tells us (*e*) that both the Popes *Agatho* and *Adrian* call them equally *the Ringleading Apostles*. Κορυφαῖοι ἀποστόλων; and *Nicholas* I. and *Gregory* VII. *the Princes of the Apostles*. Whence it is natural to collect, how little Supremacy these, or the like Expres-

(*a*) P. 231. (*b*) Ibid. (*c*) Nouv. Bibl. Tom. 3. part 2. p. 178. (*d*) Catech. 6. p. 88. Edit. Oxon. (*e*) *Of the Pope's Supremacy*, p. 75.

sions

sions attribute to St. *Peter* above St. *Paul*, or indeed above the other Apostles: And you have been already told (*a*) that St. *Augustine* was expressly stil'd *summus Christi Pontifex*, Christ's supreme or chief High-Priest, as St. *Germain* of *Paris* was also by *Venantius Fortunatus*; and that St. *Basil* not only tells St. *Athanasius* that he took care of all the Churches, in like manner as of his own, but expressly affirms, that they fled to him, ὡς πρὸς ὅλου κεφαλὴν τῶν ὅλων, *as to the Head of the whole*; and again, that the Title of the supposititious Epistle of *Clement* runs thus, Clement *to our Lord* James, *Bishop of Bishops, President over the Holy Catholick Church at* Jerusalem, *and such others as are any where settled by God's Providence*, &c. which Title, though supposititious, is however some Intimation of what was the Opinion of those Times concerning these sorts of Appellations. And all these Testimonies do abundantly confute that strange extravagant Prerogative those of your Party would build upon them, in behalf of your Sovereign Lord the Pope.

C. R. C. St. Augustine *in several places owns St. Peter's Supremacy, calling him the* first and chief *of the Apostles*, Ibid.

C. E. This is no more than those you last named have said of him, and what might be very well allow'd him, without your pretended Supremacy. The Senior Fellow of a Colledge, or the uppermost Boy in a School, is the first and chief of his Companions, as is also the eldest amongst divers Sons; but what Supremacy you can draw from hence is past my Conception, and I dare say your own too. He does indeed attribute a *Primacy* to this Apostle, which you are pleas'd (*for what reason you best know*) to interpret a *Supremacy*. But I am yet to learn how

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 53.

this

this implies any more concerning him, than what the same Father meant of him at another time, when he said that he was the first of the Apostles, (*a*) *primus Apostolus*: which by the Instances now mention'd appears to be very far from proving a Supremacy, or any sort of Jurisdiction over the other Apostles. But any thing must serve for Proof, where that which is to the purpose cannot be had.

R. C. St. Leo *in the 5th Century says*, Out of all the World *Peter* alone is chosen and prefer'd before all the Apostles, that though in God's People there be many Priests, and many Pastors, yet *Peter* should rule all properly whom *Christ* rules principally. And again, that the *Apostles had* (in respect of one another) *a different Power*, p. 24.

M. C. If by these Words of your own Insertion, *in respect of one another*, you do not mean over one another, this latter Clause seems not at all to your purpose, nor will prove any thing for St. *Peter*'s Authority over the other Apostles. But if you do mean so, I must beg leave to assure the Reader, that the Saying is your own, not Pope *Leo*'s. His Words, as you have rightly quoted them are these, *Quoniam & inter beatissimos Apostolos, in similitudine honoris, fuit quædam discretio potestatis*; because even amongst the Blessed Apostles, after the manner of Honour, there was some Distinction of Power; which might very well have been with respect to their Charge, and the extent of their Care towards those committed to them, without supposing any of them to be set over the rest. But supposing that *Leo* had said as you would have him here, and that he meant as he says in the former Passage, that Peter *alone was prefer'd before all the Apostles, and was to rule all those whom Christ rules*; this is the

(*a*) In Joan. Tract. 56.

less

less to be relied upon, as not being spoken till the fifth Century; and besides considering it is not only the saying of a Pope, and so a Judgment in his own Favour, but even of such a Pope, as seems to be intent upon magnifying his See to the utmost; one that writes himself not only *Bishop* of *Rome*, but *(a) of* Rome *and the Universal and Catholick Church*, calls his own *(b) the Apostolical See*, as if none others had been so, professes *(c) to have a principal Care committed to him over all the Churches*, and would have the Bishops *(d)* submit the *Care of the whole Church to the one Seat of* Peter, takes upon him to determine *(e)* the Case of *Eutyches* a Presbyter condemn'd at *Constantinople*, tells the *French* Bishops that his Letters are enforc'd *(f) by the Authority and Merit of his most blessed Lord* Peter *the Apostle*, reproves *Anatolius* of *Constantinople (g)* for not obeying his Legats, and dis-annuls all Determinations of Bishops made contrary to the Canons of the *Nicene* Council *(h)* by the Authority of St. *Peter* the Apostle; with a great deal more to the same Effect, which I need not repeat. Now if such a Pope as this endeavours to magnify St. *Peter*'s Authority, and thereby to advance and improve his own, this is but making himself a Judge in his own Cause; which no one not grosly under the Power of Prejudice can think reasonable. Besides, it is farther to be noted that *(i)* this Pope *Leo* speaks both of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* in such a manner, as cannot well consist with a Supremacy in the one, and Subjection in the other. He says *the Favour of God had rais'd them to such a height*

(a) Epist. 54, & 97. (b) Passim. (c) Epist. 84. c. 1 (d) Per quos ad unam Petri sedem universalis Ecclesiæ cura confluereret. c. 12. (e) Epist. 8. (f) Epist. 52. (g) Epist. 53 (h) Epist. 55. (i) Serm. 1. in Nat. Apost. Pet. & Paul. c. 7.

amongst

amongst all the Members of the Church, as to make them as a pair of Eyes, in that Body whereof Christ is the Head. De quorum meritis atque virtutibus, *&c.* as he proceeds, *of whose Merits and Virtues, which surpass all power of Expression, nothing is to be thought different, nothing distinguishing; because their Election made them co-ordinate, their Labour alike, and their End equal.* The natural Consequence of which several Considerations in relation to this Pope is, that very little regard is to be had to what he says in behalf of the pretended Supremacy of St. *Peter.*

R. C. Gelasius I. says, *The first See confirms every General Council by its Authority, and is their perpetual Guardian,* by reason of its Supremacy, *(which the Apostle St.* Peter *receiv'd from the Mouth of Christ) which the Church too hath seconded, and which that See has both always held, and does hold at present.* Ibid.

C. E. However, this is only the Saying of a Pope, and a Pope no less zealous for the extent of his own Dominion than his Predecessor *Leo*; and whose Authority therefore, in a Case of this Nature, can signify no more than his. And it is other sort of Testimony we want, not that of Popes in their own behalf. Besides that the *Vindicator* has shewn that what this Pope asserts (*a*) is false in Fact. And you do not pretend in any wise to disprove his Evidence.

R. C. S. *Bernard* speaks also to the same purpose, p. 25.

C. E. But St. *Bernard* is somewhat of the latest to be produc'd as a Witness here: He liv'd in the 12th Century; and it will be hard to prove either the Faith or Practice of the Primitive Church, from one who was at so great a distance from it. So that nothing but want of good sufficient Evidence, could tempt you to look so far back for it, since you were sure before hand, that

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 47.

whatever you could find in that Age would never do your Business. And yet even this *incomparable St.* Bernard, if you will believe one of your own Doctors, (*a*) *allows no Power to the Pope, that he does not allow likewise to other inferior Bishops; howsoever he allows the Pope the greatest share of it,* And tho' it is granted the Pope was generally submitted to, and his supream Power own'd in St. *Bernard's* Time, yet he makes heavy Complaint of the abuse of it. I will give you but one instance out of divers that occur in his Writings. He tells Pope *Eugenius*, That (*b*) *Abbots are exempted from the Jurisdiction of their Bishops; Bishops from that of Arch-bishops; Arch-bishops from that of their Patriarchs or Primates.* This he says caus'd great Murmuring and Complaint of the Churches. (*c*) Adding, that *by this means you manifest that you have a plenitude of Power; but perhaps not so of Justice. You do this because you can, but it is a Question however, whether you ought to do it.* Besides that I have told you before, (*d*) that to *feed the Flock is no more* in St. *Bernard's* Notion of it, *than to preach the Gospel*; and that *to do the Work of an Evangelist, is to fulfil the Pastor's Office.*

R. C. Nevertheless you must acknowledge, *that this great Saint has cut off all Dr.* Barrow's *Suppositions at once*, p. 26.

C. E. When you write next, be pleas'd to let us know how; for it does not at all appear at present, and a bare Assertion will not pass for Proof, especially against an Author of Dr. *Barrow's*

(*a*) *Bernardus* nullam potestatem ponit in Papâ, quam non ponit in Prælatis inferioribus: licet in Papâ ponat summam. *Joan.* de Parisiis, cap. 18. (*b*) De Consideratione, l. 3. c. 4. (*c*) Sic factitando probatis habere Plenitudinem potestatis, sed justitiæ fortè non ita. Facitis hoc quia potestis, sed utrum & debetis, quæstio est, *Ibid.* (*d*) P. 37.

Eminence,

Eminence, and when your Citations against him are of a late date.

R. C. *The Vindicator objects the Words of S.* Paul *to the Elders of* Ephesus, *Act.* 20. 28, *that they must* take care of all the Flock, and feed the Church of God: *but this comes far short of the Mark.*

C. E. But I am apt to suspect you cannot shew how. You argue indeed from the first Words, that they had a limited Jurisdiction, and so were to *take heed* only to that part of *the Flock, over which the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers*, or rather Bishops. But then you seem not to take Notice that the Vindicator's Argument was founded upon the last Words, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, *to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood.* And I would be glad to know what difference there is between this Commission, and that of feeding the Lambs and Sheep. Had these Words been spoken to St. *Peter*, they had no doubt been to all Intents and Purposes, as good a Foundation for an unlimited Supremacy, as those others are or can be. Hence therefore I argue; either these Words denote a limited or an unlimited Power and Jurisdiction. If an unlimited, here are then a great many other Supreams, besides St. *Peter*, which is no way pretended. If only a limited, then it will be impossible to prove from the Words spoken to him, that his was not so too.

SECT. IV.

R. C. WE come next to our Saviour's Promise, St. *Mat.* 16. 17, 18, 19. *Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou* Simon Barjona; *for Flesh and Blood hath not reveal'd it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. And I say*

also unto thee, that thou art Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church; and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven*, p.27.

C.E. And what use do you make of these Words?

R. C. I say little or nothing to the last Verse about the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven being given to St. *Peter*.

C. E. In truth I think you need not; for as it is said to St. *Peter* here, *I will giv thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind*, &c. so it is said to the Apostles in general, in the next Chapter but one, *Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye*, not St. *Peter* alone, but *ye*, or any of you, *whatsoever* **Ye** *shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever* **Ye** *shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven*; Ch. 18. 18. Where you see the very same Power granted to them all, that before was promis'd to St. *Peter*: and again, S. *Jo.* 20. 21, 22, 23. our Lord sent them all forth with a full Commission for the Government of his Church, even such as he himself had receiv'd from the Father. *Jesus said unto them again, Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retain'd.* As also St. *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. they are all equally empower'd *to go and* (a) *make Disciples of all Nations*, &c. with a Promise from our Saviour, that he would be with them and their Successors, as long as the World shall last. *I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World*, Amen. In all which places the Power promis'd to St. *Peter*, is apparently confer'd upon al the

(a) Μαθητεύσατε.

other

other Apostles, as well as him: and by Consequence he can have no peculiar Superiority over the rest, by virtue of this Promise, as the learned Arch-bishop of *Spalato* observ'd long since, who thus argues in behalf of the rest of the Apostles.

'If the (*a*) most holy *Roman* Pontif, in Conversation with his most beloved Prelates, all whom he design'd to promote to the Dignity of Cardinals, should say to some one amongst them, I will make thee a Cardinal, but withal on another day should promise the same to all the rest, and not long after should actually perform it; though he should in the first place name that same Prelate, to whom he had first promis'd this mark of his Favour; who, I beseech you, would take upon him to conclude him made Lord and Prince of the others, with a singular Jurisdiction over them all? I would indeed conclude this and no more, *says he*, and justly might do it, that he was singularly belov'd by the Pope above them all, or that his Merits were greater than theirs, or something of the like Nature. It was therefore one thing for *Peter* to have receiv'd the Keys first, as St. *Augustine* grants, *Tract. ult. in Joan.* and another to have receiv'd them by himself alone, which no one grants. Nay I shew, *says he*, That nothing was promis'd to St. *Peter*, that was not promis'd likewise to the other Apostles, and conferr'd by Christ himself upon them'. As he proceeds to prove from St. *Cyprian*, *Origen*, St. *Jerome* and several others; all whose Authority I forbear to cite at present, but whosoever pleases may consult them at his Leisure.

R. C. I have given you the Words of the Pope's Legates, both in the Council of *Ephesus*, and that

(*a*) De Rep. Eccl. l. 1. c. 7.

of

of *Chalcedon*, declaring St. *Peter* to be *the Pillar of Faith, and the Foundation of the Catholick Church*, p. 42, 43.

C. E. Nevertheless, I hope the Authority of so many great unprejudiced Fathers, is preferable to the Sayings of a few of the Pope's own Creatures, pleading in behalf of their Master; especially since I have already shewn St. *Peter*'s being stil'd the Pillar or Foundation of the Church to be no real Proof of any Supremacy in him; much less in his Successors at *Rome*. As for these, your own great Champion *Bellarmin* confesses no less when he pleads, not that it is certain, but only *(a) that it is not improbable that our Lord did apparently command, that* Peter *should so fix his Seat at* Rome, *that the Bishop of* Rome *should absolutely succeed him. But howsoever this be,* says he, *the reason of that Succession is not from the first Institution of the Pontificate, which we read of in the Gospel.* But now if you please, we will return to the 17th and 18th Verses, about St. *Peter*'s being the *Rock* on which the *Church* was to be built.

R. C. With all my Heart. Only let me tell you, that one of these Legates *cuts off all Dr.* Barrow's *Suppositions at one single Blow*, p. 42.

C. E. Poor Dr. *Barrow!* what hard Fortune it is for his learned Treatise, that has stood impregnable for near these fourty Years, to be now so easily thrown down! p. 26. His Suppositions were *cut off all at once*, and now again they are in like manner *cut off at one single Blow*. This is quick Work, but the loudest Talkers are not always the best Men at their Weapons. A Truth of which you have given us here a sufficient instance,

(*a*) Non est improbabile Dominum etiam apertè jussisse, ut sedem suam Petrus ita figeret Romæ, ut Romanus Episcopus absolutè ei succederet, sed quicquid de hoc sit, saltem est ratio Successionis non ex primâ institutione Pontificatus, quæ in Evangelio legitur. *De Rom. Pont.* l. 2. c. 12.

you

you only cite the Words of the Pope's Legates against him, as if this were enough to out-weigh all the Multitude of Evidences he has brought on the other side. But to come to our proper Business, as to St. *Peter*'s being the *Rock or Foundation-Stone* of the Church, p. 27.

R. C. The Words are clearly on our side.

C. E. The *Restater* had refer'd to St. *Cyprian*, St. *Basil*, St. *Chrysostom*, St. *Jerome* and St. *Augustine*, for his sense of the words before us. Whereupon the *Vindicator* having shewn, that not one of these Fathers answer'd the Design propos'd, and having produced some others of them in direct Opposition to him, instead of attempting to answer these Testimonies, you now very fairly give them all up, and tell us, *If any of the Fathers understood the Rock* here spoken of, *either of* Christ, or of St. *Peter*'s *Faith*, *they did not understand it in the literal Sense, but either applied it to a mystical or causal Sense, or mistook the literal.* What you mean by this *mystical or causal Sense*, you don't pretend to give us any Information, which makes me suspect you most inclin'd to stick to the latter Charge, that they were mistaken. But take them in whether of these Senses you please, it is evident you yield them to be against you, and so have nothing to say for them.

R. C. Because the words of our Saviour are plain against them, almost to a *Demonstration*, p 29. For when our Saviour said to S. *Peter*, *Thou art Peter*, &c. (*a*) *it was the same thing, as if he had said in our Language, Thou art a Rock, and upon this Rock I will build my Church*, p. 28.

C. E. Where then is the Faithfulness of your infallible Vulgar Translation, that as plainly distinguishes between *Petrus*, Peter, and *Petra*, the Rock, as ours, or any other does? According to your

your own Bible, the words are not the same; and how then will you build upon them as though they were?

R. C. I cannot deny but our Version after all the Care that has been taken about it, and the Authority by which it has been published, is, at least, as Authentick as the *Syriack*, or any other.

C. E. I remember, that in a Conference had not very long since, the Priest, who maintained your Cause, even the General of the *Jesuites*, if I be not misinformed, (this I may say, since being dead it can now do him no hurt) preferred it before the *Greek*. Now, if your own Bibles, thus highly preferred by those of your own Party, be against you, I am apt to think there is an end of your *Demonstration*.

R. C. Who ever said, the House was built upon the Mason? This cannot be the Literal Sense of the Words. Tho' Mr. L's *Vindicator seems willing his Reader should think so, in spite of common Sense*, p. 29.

C. E. If you please to think again, you will soon perceive, that the *Vindicator* supposes the words to be spoken in a Figurative, not in a Literal Sense. And if it were otherwise, you would be as hard put to it to maintain your ground, as He. For if it be an Absurdity to say the House is built upon the Mason; is it not as much so, to say the City of *London* is built upon the Lord Mayor, the Church of *England* upon the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, or that of *Rome* upon the *Pope*? Is it not every whit as far, or rather farther, from a strictly Literal Expression, to say the Church, or any sort of Body Corporate, is built upon its chief Governor, as to say, it is built upon its first Founder? Yet, this latter you are *willing your Reader should suppose, whether in spite of common Sense*, I leave yourself to judge.

R. C.

R. C. If Christ promised to build his whole Church *upon S.* Peter, *we must either say, he did not keep his Word, which is* Blasphemy, *or that the* Apostles *were not part of his Church, which is little better; or that they were built upon S.* Peter, *p.* 30.

C. E. But what if you say, Christ promised to build his Church upon S. *Peter*, all of it, I mean, that was then to be built? I presume, there is neither Blasphemy, nor Absurdity in this? I mean all that was to be built after the Foundation was first laid; as it was in the other Apostles as well as S. *Peter*. S. *Paul* expressly tells the *Ephesians*, Chap. 2. 20. that, they were all Foundation-stones in the Spiritual Building, as the Prophets also had in a less degree been before them; and our Blessed Lord himself was in a far more eminent; and by consequence, S. *Peter* was not the only Foundation of the Church. *And are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone.* Hence the *Vindicator* had observed (*a*) that *the other Apostles were Foundation-stones in this Ecclesiastical Building, and not S.* Peter *alone.* As Mr. *L.* also had done before him; Who had moreover made a like Observation from *Rev.* 21. 14.

R. C. And I have told him these Observations *will do him little Service*, p. 31.

C. E. But I am of opinion, you had no good reason for saying it.

R. C. As to the former of these places, I say, S. *John* there *describes the Glory of the Saints; with reference to those Virtues in this Life, by which it is obtained*, p. 32.

C. E. But you give neither Reason, nor Authority for saying so, and cannot expect to be believed without either of them.

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 19.

R. C. I add farther, that S. *Peter has no Supremacy in Heaven.* Ibid.

C. E. This I am sure is no Proof, that he has any upon Earth. And so I need say no more as to this Text. Be pleased therefore to let us know, what you have to say to the Passage to the *Ephesians*, and whether you can bring your self off there, any better than you have done here.

R. C. The literal and most natural Sense of the Words, seems to be, that the Foundation here intended is *the Godhead, or Divine Revelation, upon which the Prophets and Apostles were grounded as well as we.* Ibid.

C. E. This is such a *Literal* and *Natural* Sense of the Words, as, for ought I know, never came into any one's Head before your own. And if it be so *natural* an Interpretation, it is very strange it should not have been known sooner. That it was not, is a strong ground of Suspicion that it is not right. And I am sure it has been thought, that the Words have another more truly *Literal and Natural Sense* than this. Θεμέλιος ὁι Ἀπόστολοι καὶ ὁι Προφῆται, says (*a*) S. *Chrysostom*; *The Apostles and Prophets are the Foundation. And are built upon the Apostles and Prophets*, says S. *Ambrose*, (*b*) *Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner Stone.* Hoc est super novum & vetus Testamentum collocati. Quod enim Apostoli prædicaverunt, Prophetæ futurum dixerunt, *&c. That it, are settled upon the* New *and* Old Testament. *For what the Apostles preached, the Prophets had foretold should be. And though the Apostle tells the* Corinthians, God placed in the Church first Apostles, and Prophets in the second place, *these are another sort of Prophets. For there he disputes about the Ordering of the Church,*

(*a*) *In* Loc. (*b*) *In* Loc.

but

but here concerning the Foundation of it. For the Prophets put things in order, but the (a) *Apostles laid the Foundations. Whence the Lord says to* Peter, Upon this Rock I will build my Church; *that is, upon this Confession of the Catholick Faith, I will establish the Faithful unto Life.* Where you see, that not only S. *Peter's* Confession of the true Faith is said to be the Rock, on which the Church was to be built; but moreover, that the Apostles, in general, laid the Foundation of it, by preaching the same Doctrine to the World. *Fundamentum aliud nemo potest ponere præter id quod positum est, quod est Christus Jesus: Deinde ipsi Apostoli & Prophetæ,* says S. *Augustin* (b) *Other Foundation can no Man lay, than what is laid; which is Christ Jesus; and after him the Apostles and Prophets.* Θεμελιοῦνται δὲ Προφῆται καὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, says *Oecumenius* (c) *The Prophets and Apostles are laid as a Foundation.* And indeed I have never met with any one, that has hit upon this new and groundless Construction before you.

R. C. Take it then in your own Sense, and *so it proves* S. *Peter's* Supremacy. *Ibid.*

C. E. It is very surprizing, that so plain a Proof against the Supremacy contended for, should at length be found to prove it

R. C. Since the other Apostles were Doctors, no less infallible than S. Peter, *they could not depend on him as a Doctor, teaching them the Mysteries of Christian Faith; the Truth whereof they both knew and taught, as well as he.* Ibid.

C. E. Very true.

R. C. Therefore the continual Dependence signified, S. Matt. 16. 18. *must necessarily regard his Jurisdiction.* Ibid.

(a) Apostoli fundamenta jeceruut. (b) *In* Psalm 81. (c) *Com. in ep. ad* Ephes. *cap.* 2.

C. E. It were a much better inference, therefore they were Co-founders with him; and had no Dependence upon him. As after all you have offered to the contrary, it must be confessed they had not; they being no more built upon him, than he was upon them; which was not at all.

R. C. The Humility of the Apostles, and the much greater of their *Prince, shews the vanity of near one half of Dr.* Barrow's *Objections against* S. Peter's *Supremacy:* Who tells us, *There was nothing of the* Papal Stile *in St.* Peter's *Epistles*, p. 33.

C. E. Here to maintain S. *Peter's* supposed Supremacy, you stick not to throw dirt upon his Successors the Popes, whom you acknowledge to have used a different and more Authoritative Stile than he. Which I leave you to answer to your own Party; only begging leave of you to take notice, that Dr. *Barrow's* Objections are no way invalidated by a vain surmise of S. *Peter's* having a Jurisdiction, which he never thought fit to make use of; and your resolving all into his Humility, is no better than a begging the Question, which you ought to have proved.

R. C. After what I have said, *p.* 35, 36. I hope you will not insist, that S. *Peter's* Supremacy is *a Dishonour to Christ*, the only Supreme Head of the whole Church, S. *Peter* as well as others.

C. E. I do not love Differences where they can fairly be avoided. And I will therefore freely confess to you, that I do not apprehend your Writers, to magnify the imaginary Supremacy of S. *Peter*, in opposition to that of our Saviour, but as subordinate to it. And so we are both agreed in that Point; I wish we were as well in the other Disputes that are between us.

R. C.

R. C. *Mr. L. assures us, the Rock on which Christ said he would build his Church, was not S.* Peter, *but the Faith which* Peter *then confessed,* and cites *divers of the Fathers to prove it. And his* Vindicator *adds others to them; which surely will be enough to degrade S.* Peter, *p.* 37.

C. E. They are unquestionably enough to shew, that the *Restater* was grosly mistaken (*a*) when he disallow'd of Mr. *L*'s Fathers for the Proof of their teaching the *Rock* mention'd by our Saviour to be S. *Peter*'s Confession and not his Person; and defied *him, and all his Party, to shew any Passage, of any Father, that excludes S.* Peter. Which Challenge of his, the Vindicator undertook to answer, and you have not been able to make any tolerable Reply to him. First, having observed, that Mr. *L*'s Testimonies stand firm and unshaken, next, he considers those of the *Restater*, and shews the weakness and insufficiency thereof, and then subjoins some other Authorities in confirmation of what Mr. *L.* had offered; which you would do well to consider of.

R. C. I know it very well, and have told you, *Mr.* L's *Six Fathers, are taken out of a nameless and shameless Pamphlet, call'd,* Friendly and Seasonable Advice to the Roman Catholicks of *England, p.* 37.

C. E. *Bona verba quaeso*; would a little civiler Language have done any harm? That Mr. *L*'s Fathers are all in that learned Author, is news to me. But supposing they were, are they ever the worse for that? I hope that has not taken away the force of what they say. You do not deny the Truth of it, and it is therefore still to be looked upon as good Evidence, till some way or other disproved. But as to Mr. *L.* sup-

(*a*) *Case Restated,* p. 11.

posing

posing this Author and him, to have cited the same Authors, and to the same purpose, might not this be, without his having taken them from the other, *Hand over head*, as you express it? And again, This is indeed a *Nameless* Tract; but why must it be a *Shameless* one too? It is soberly and learnedly written, and, as I thought, when I read it formerly, with very good Judgment. And I cannot think, why you should treat it in this scurrilous manner; but only that it pinches a little too close, and has made you angry. But be that as it will; it is enough for my purpose, that the Citations here produced, are such as you do not pretend to disprove, which is a just reason for every one to conclude you could not. Besides, to fortify this proof, so well established before, and fully to answer the *Restorer*'s Challenge, the *Vindicator* produces several others against you.

R. C. I have already told you, *he reckons* S. Justin, Theodoret *and* Theophylact; *to which he adds* Palladius, *and a* Saxon Homily *quoted by* Bede.

C. E. To whom, if you had pleased, you might have subjoined S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and S. *Augustine*, for their Testimonies are as legible at least, as any of the other. To whom I add now also (a) *Modestus*, Archbishop of *Jerusalem*. And pray what have you to say to them all?

R. C. I make a jest of it, and tell you ironically, *These surely will be enough to degrade St.* Peter.

C. E. It is well you have no better a Reply to make. You know many a true word is spoken in jest; and yet never the less true for that.

(a) Πέτρος ὠνομάζετο διὰ τὴν ἀσάλευτον πίστιν ἣν εἶχεν ἐπὶ χειρὸν τὴν πέτραν. Mod. Arch. Hierosol. apud *Phot.* Bibl. Cod. 275.

R. C.

R. C. A little after I nibble at three of your Authors, and tell you, they *are but Ninth Rate Fathers, and so will do but little Service*, p. 38.

C. E. A notable piece of Wit I profess: But it would have done well if there had been some Argument in it. Only the Case would not admit of it.

R. C. I do not take upon me to disprove your having the Fathers on your side, as to the Interpretation of S. *Peter*'s being the Rock. But then give me leave to acquaint you, that *Their Opposition can be of no great weight. For denying one particular Proof, is not denying the* Conclusion. *Ibid.*

C. E. This is plain dealing, and a downright giving up the Cause as to S. *Matt.* 16. 18. And now I have this reasonable Request to make to you; That not being able to maintain your Construction of this place, you will no more undertake to argue from it, as if you could.

R. C. *I have shewn already, that if any of the Ancients understood the* Rock, *either of* Christ, *or of* S. Peter's Faith, *they must either have applied it to a* Moral *or* Causal *Sense*, or *mistaken the Literal.* Ibid.

C. E. That is, you find they are manifestly against you, and therefore think it necessary to declare them unacquainted with the true Meaning of the Text; and to defy all Musters of them, how true, or how numerous soever; as you do in the next words. They either take the words, as I noted before, in you know not what Sense, or else they don't understand them. Very well. But we know in what Sense they take them, and are very well content with it, and challenge you to disprove it when you can. Which, since you are sensible you cannot do, it is not so very fair to argue from a Personal Promise to S. *Peter*; as you do in reference to *Abraham*, and the Promise made to him; which was certainly a Personal

sonal Promise, though it is granted *his Faith was the Occasion of it.*

R. C. You are as positive, as if you had carried your Case, and yet you cannot but see, *p.* 40. *&c.* that I have a stock of Fathers for you, that are express for S. *Peter's* being the Rock spoken of by our Lord.

C. E. However, I presume, you will allow, that in those places, they are to be understood in such a Sense, as is consistent with these other. Which can no way be so well done, as by supposing the Church to be built upon S. *Peter*, only as he first after our Lord laid the Foundation of it, by preaching first among both *Jews* and *Gentiles*; as the *Vindicator* (*a*) urged before. It is matter of Fact, that this was S. *Peter's* Province, and this is what seemed to have been promised him, if any thing was promised to him, more than to the rest, in S. *Matt.* 16. 18. I do not observe that any of them speak inconsistently with this Notion, and some of them, as well as some others, declare themselves for it. Thus S. *Basil* describes S. *Peter* to be, Τὸν διὰ πίστεως ὑπερεχοντα ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας δεξάμενον, *him who, through the excellency of his Faith, took upon him the Building of the Church.* Before whom, *Tertullian* says expressly (*b*) *In ipso Ecclesia extructa est, id est, per ipsum*, In, or upon, him was the Church built, *that is by him.* Than which nothing could be more clear for our Sense of this Promise of our Saviour. But to this you are pleased to object, *p.* 29. that this was after he was fallen into Heresy.

R. C. And is not that a sufficient Answer to him?

C. E. I conceive not, for two Reasons. 1. Because most of his Writings being supposed, by

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 19. (*b*) De Pudic. *c.* 21.

learned

learned Men, to have been written after he inclined to *Montanism*, as far as ever he seems to have done it, you will hardly say, that after that, no regard was to be had to any thing he wrote. And if you do not condemn all he wrote after that, it will be incumbent upon you to shew why you conceive no regard is to be had to this. 2. Because you cannot, and accordingly do not pretend to prove, that any good Author, before this time, ever was of your Side of this Question; and by Consequence, *Tertullian*'s Sense of the Promise made to S. *Peter*, seems to have been then, and before, the general Sense of the Church concerning it. Consult the two *Clements*, S. *Barnabas*, *Hermas*, *Irenæus*, S. *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Justin Martyr*, and their contemporary Writers; and I am much mistaken, if you find in them any such exalted Testimonies in behalf of S. *Peter*, as came in afterwards, though very often not in such a Sense as those of your Party study to fix upon them; as I have already shewn. And here *Tertullian*, whom for these Reasons I must insist upon, is flatly against you. To the same purpose speaks likewise *Gregory Nazianzen*, whose words you here produce, but wisely forbear to English them: Ὁ μὲν πέτρος καλεῖται, καὶ τοῖς θεμελίοις τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πεπίσευται, or as it is in my Book πεσεῖται. *One is called the Rock, and has the Foundations of the Church committed to him*; that is to say, that he should be the first Layer of them; for I am sure you can give no other so natural Interpretation of the Phrase. In like manner, as S. *Augustin* gives this for a Reason of S. *Peter*'s being called a Rock (*b*) *because he first laid the Foundations of Faith to the Nations.* Petra enim dicitur, eò quod primus nationibus fidei fundamenta posuerit.

(*a*) In festo Cathedræ Sti Petri. *Serm.* 2.

R. C. What say you to the Vindicator's Inference (*a*) from that passage of S. *Jerom*. That *here his Fellow Apostles have also the same Name, because they were the Lights of the World?* This I have noted, p. 41. to be an Inference that *scarce can be paralleled*.

C. E. If this were apparent of it self, there would not have needed any art to disguise the matter; but you might have given us the Father's whole Period, and the *Vindicator*'s own words. Which since you was not pleased to do, I hope you will pardon me, if I do it for you: The Father's words are these, '*Sicut ipse lumen Apostolis dederit, &c.* As he gave light to the Apostles, that they might be called the Light of the World: and they received other Appellations from him: So also to *Simon*, who believed in Christ the Rock, he gave the Name of *Peter*. And according to the Metaphor of a Rock, it is rightly said to him, I will build my Church upon Thee. *Agreeably whereto the* Vindicator *argues thus*; Here the words you refer to denote S. *Peter*, not his Faith or Profession, to be the Rock on which the Church was to be built. But withal you see, that it was only in common with his Fellow Apostles, to whom the Lord gave the Priviledge of being Lights to the World, whereby to conduct them to his Church and Religion.". As much as to say, As our Lord gave the other Apostles the Name of Lights, because they were to enlighten the World with their Doctrine; so, that is, in like manner, or for the same reason, he called *Peter* a Rock, and declared, that upon him the Church should be built, namely, because he was to be the first amongst them, that

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 15.

should

should thus enlighten both *Jews* and *Gentiles*. And if you can discover any false Argumentation in this, you may please to quarrel with S. *Jerom* for it, rather than the *Vindicator*, who only acquaints us with the whole passage of the Father, and his Design and Intent in it. Which you found it not for your purpose to do.

SECT. V.

R. C. IN the next Section it is observed, that the *Vindicator*, p. 49. *objects*, Scotus, Cordubensis, Cajetan, and Banniez. *But since he did not think their words worth his quoting, I do not think them worth my answering.* p. 43.

C. E. You may please to remember, that the *Vindicator* referred you for the Sense of these Authors, to a learned Author of your own, who, whatever he is in *French*, is, you know, *a Catholick* in *English*, Mr. *Du Pin*, in his Discourse *de Antiq. Eccl. Discipl. Dissert.* 4. p. 334. Who there tells us, the Doctrine of these Men was, that 'The Episcopate of the City and the World met 'in one only by accident, not by any Divine 'Right, or Command of Christ; so as that 'the Bishop of *Rome* is not by a Divine Right 'S. *Peter's* Successor; but the Bishop of *Paris*, 'or any other, might be chosen Successor of 'S. *Peter*'. And it is worth your while to try, if you can shew they have not said it, because, till that be done, they stand as Witnesses on our Side.

R. C. But what say you to S. *Cyprian*?

C. E. From *p.* 49. you skip back to *p.* 13. and say, he 'shuffles off an Authority of S. *Cy*-'*prian*, with the Exposition of *Rigaltius*, an eminent Commentator, he says, of our Commu-

'nion? And tell me, I pray, what shuffling is there in this? Does he not quote him right?

R. C. I do not deny that. But I say 'Since 'he likes *Rigaltius* so well, he may take him. 'For he writes like an eminent *Calvinist* in mas-'querade. *Ibid.*

C. E. This is only because he does not concur with you. But we have not his Opinion only, but of two of the *Sorbon* Doctors, *A. de Breda*, and *M. Grandin*, who both testify their approbation of his Observations and Notes on S. *Cyprian*, as also did the same *De Breda*, and Mr. *Flavigny*, another Brother of the *Sorbon*, for his Notes upon *Tertullian*. And no reason at all appears, why these may not be as good, or indeed better Judges of the Doctrines of your Church, than Mr. *H.* or any other such private Author. But it may be you will give all these up too, as well as *Rigaltius*, for *Calvinists in masquerade*, since they have ventured to recommend a Commentator that is not to your liking.

R. C. Mr. *L.* says, 'Nothing that was said of 'S. *Peter*, is so express for an universal Suprema-'cy, as what S. *Paul* said of himself, 2 *Cor.* xi. 28. 'and 1 *Cor.* vii. 17. p. 44'. but this I have told you, *any one might have said as well as* S. Paul; namely, that *The Care of all the Churches lies upon me*, and *so ordain I in all Churches.*

C. E. But Mr. *L*'s Enquiry was not whether any other of the Apostles might have said this, but whether it was not more express for a Supremacy, than any thing that had been said of St. *Peter*; and this you do not any way disprove. You say indeed *it is fitting, that as every one of the Apostles had Jurisdiction over all Christians, excepting his Fellow Apostles, so one of them should have Jurisdiction over the rest*; which I utterly deny, and you do not offer at the least Proof of it. So that

there

there was no need for St. *Paul* to say, *or the Scripture, for him, that he was the Man*, since you only presume, but do not prove any one to be so. You add, that had this been said of St. *Peter, it might have prov'd his Apostleship, but not his Supremacy.* However, it does not follow from hence that it would not have prov'd his Supremacy, as well as either *Upon this Rock*, &c. or *Feed my Sheep.* And both (*a*) Mr. *L.* and (*b*) the *Vindicator* have urg'd, that had any thing of this nature been said of St. *Peter*, it *would have been made use of towards proving his universal Supremacy*, and even *more than the whole New Testament besides*; which is so undeniable, that you do not pretend to make any Reply to it. You make an Excursion indeed, about the Sovereign Power of Princes, in which were you suppos'd for the present to be in the right, you would be never the nearer proving St. *Peter* to have had a Supremacy over the rest of the Apostles, which was the Point to have been maintain'd, had you known how to do it.

R. C. The Vindicator and *Dr.* Barrow *before him, cry out amain that God's Order is inverted, if St.* John *after St.* Peter's *Death was subject to a Disciple*, p. 45.

C. E. And how do you disprove either of them?

R. C. I do not go about it, but only tell them by way of Reproach, *if both St.* John, *and all the other Apostles must truckle (in the Government of the Church) to a Sheep of their own Flock* [*meaning a Christian Prince*] *there is no Disorder in the Case.*

C. E. Then it seems you make no Difference betwixt the Obedience due to a Christian Prince, and that unlimited Subjection which the *Roman* Pontiff requires. What Obedience our Church teaches to Princes, I have shewn at the beginning of this Tract; and for that Reason, as well as

(*a*) *Case stated*, p. 5. (*b*) *Case truly stated*, p. 30.

because

because it is not to the point in hand, I forbear to say any more of it.

R. C. It is objected, *St.* Peter *was the Apostle of the* Jews, *and they were his peculiar Charge.* And yet it must be own'd, *that neither his Jurisdiction was confin'd to the* Jews, *nor St.* Paul's, *to the* Gentiles, p. 45, 46.

C. E. However, since *the Gospel of the Circumcision was committed to him, as that of the Uncircumcision was to St.* Paul, *Gal.* 2. 7, 8, 9. it is a natural Inference that *Rome* being a Heathen City, St. *Paul* the Apostle of the *Gentiles* should have the greatest Interest there, and that if St. *Peter* had had such a Supremacy as you contend for, he should not have settled it at *Rome*, but either at his first See *Antioch*, or rather at *Jerusalem*, where were most of the People committed to his Care. And all you offer here to the contrary, is only that he baptiz'd *Cornelius*, and preach'd sometimes to the *Gentiles*, as St. *Paul* did also upon occasion to the *Jews*; which might very well be, and yet either the *Antiochians* or the *Jews* have the best Right to his See.

R. C. In answer to what is objected about St. *Paul's* withstanding St. *Peter* to the Face, *Gal.* 2. 11. I have noted that *till Superiors are impeccable, it will always be lawful for Subjects to reprehend them even in Publick, with the Zeal and Charity of St.* Paul, p. 46.

C. E. Here the *Vindicator* (*a*) profess'd himself persuaded, *such* an open Opposition would not be allow'd of, as a suitable Carriage towards your Sovereign Lord the Pope. And you do not pretend to affirm it would: nor can you, I am satisfied, give any one instance wherein it has been practiced, and not discountenanc'd and severely condemn'd.

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 26.

R. C.

R. C: *Here the* Vindicator *tells us*, 1st, *That according to St.* Cyprian, *Epist.* 71. *St.* Peter *did not insolently claim, or arrogantly assume any thing to himself, as if he had a Superiority over the rest.* 2dly, That *Hilary the Deacon*, in *Gal.* 2. 11. says, Saint *Paul knew himself invested with an Equality of Power*, p. 47.

C. E. And does not this shew that neither of these Fathers look'd upon St. *Peter* to be invested in such a supream Authority, as those of your Party ascribe to him?

R. C. *They are both falsly translated*, Ibid.

C. E. This is a harsh Accusation, and I hope you have consider'd it well, before you undertook to fix it upon the *Vindicator*; because if you cannot clearly make it out, it will recoil upon your self, and you must bear the Shame of it.

R. C. *St.* Cyprian *does not say, St.* Peter *did not carry himself insolently, as if he had the Superiority over the rest, which would plainly signify that he had none; but so as to say that he had the Primacy, which is quite different*, Ibid.

C. E. *Quite different* you say; but will you be so kind as to shew me wherein the mighty Difference lies. Does not St. *Cyprian* expressly affirm (*a*) that St. *Peter did not insolently claim, or arrogantly assume any thing to himself*? This you cannot deny to be a stricter and more unexceptionable Translation of the Words, than what you say, that he *did not carry himself insolently*. But it seems the *Vindicator* has not kept much more nicely to the following Words, than you have done to these. He adds, *as if he had a Superiority over the rest, and that he ought to be obeyed by the recentest and latter Apo-*

Nec Petrus----Vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpsit, ut diceret se primatum tenere, & obtemperari à novellis & posteris sibi debere.

stles;

stles; whereas say you it should have been, *so as to say that he had the Primacy*, by which you presently after declare your self to mean the *Supremacy*; and what advantage you propose to your self by this pretended Emendation is a Mystery to me. For does not St. *Cyprian*'s Denial of St. *Peter*'s insolently and arrogantly claiming or assuming any thing to himself, *so as to say that he had the Primacy, and ought to be obey'd by the recentest and latter Apostles*; does not his Denial of this concerning the Apostle necessarily imply, that to take upon him to say this, would have been *Insolence* and *Arrogance*? And why do you leave out the following Words, insolently and arrogantly, *and ought to be obey'd by the recentest and latter Apostles*, but because you found them directly against you? The impartial Reader may easily see from hence, how unhappy you have been in attempting to correct the *Vindicator*'s Translation of Saint *Cyprian*, and how little you have got by it.

R. C. You do not attend to what follows, *'Tis evident that St.* Cyprian *does not deny the Primacy; but only says it would have been* Pride *in him to have mention'd it in that Circumstance, as it really would.*

C. E. I had not forgot this doughty Argument, nor was it for your Interest to remind me of it if I had. For I appeal to your own Eyes, whether you can find any thing like this in St. *Cyprian*. *Lynceus* himself would not have been able to discover it there, nor I am sure can you, how quick sighted soever you may be. St. *Cyprian* says not one Word *of a new Sin of Pride*, unless you mean in his Saying St. *Peter did not insolently and arrogantly* take upon him to say *that he had the Primacy, and ought to be obey'd*, &c. which is exactly, though not the same Words, what the Vindicator had told you; and for which you are offended at him.

R. C.

R. C. *Nay, St.* Cyprian, *if we will do him Justice, in that very place positively owns the Supremacy of St.* Peter; *for thus are his Words to be render'd. Neither did* Peter, *whom the Lord chose to be the chief, and on whom he built his Church, when* Paul *disputed with him about Circumcision* (that is about the *Jews*) *insolently claim, or arrogantly assume any thing to himself, so as to say, that he had the Primacy* (or Superiority above the rest) *and that he ought to be obey'd by the recentest and last Apostles.* *If* Primum *were an Adverb, it would signify that St.* Peter *was a more ancient Disciple than St.* Andrew, *contrary to St.* John 1. *v.* 40. 41, 42. *It must then be an Adjective, and denote that he was chosen to be the chief, or chosen to be the first* p. 48.

C. R. Here it is of no great Consequence as to the Business we are upon, that you say *about Circumcision, that is about the Jews*; though it is certain there is no reason for this Note of yours. For *Circumcision* here is meant to signify, what it most properly does in other places, together with the other Rites and Usages of the Law. In which St. *Peter* had at *Antioch* been too compliant to the *Jews*, there, not out of any hypocritical Design of recommending himself to their good Opinion; but least the contrary Practice should have had an ill Influence upon them, and prejudiced them against Christianity, by their observing a greater Freedom used there amongst the *Gentiles*, than was customary at *Jerusalem* amongst the *Jews*. The whole Dispute was not about the People of the *Jews*, but their Ceremonies and Customs, and manner of living, v. 14. and therefore why *Circumcision* in this place must signify the *Jews*, is what I cannot comprehend; this I take to be very plain. Nevertheless, being

as I said of little or no Importance as to our present Business, I choose rather to proceed to what is of more immediate concern to us. Which is that you affirm, that *our Lord chose* Peter *to be the chief* [amongst his Apostles;] and you give this reason for it, that to suppose *Primum* to be an Adverb, and intimate only that he was first call'd is contrary to St. *John* 1. 40, 41, 42. Now I must freely own that I am very averse from any wise contradicting the Holy Scripture; but then I must beg of you to help me out, as to the proof of this Assertions being contradictory to the Doctrine of St. *John*, for I cannot see that it is so. For though from hence it appears that St. *Andrew* was first call'd to be a Disciple, yet that St. *Peter* was first constituted an Apostle, I take to be plain from St. *Mat.* 10. 2. and St. *Luke* 6. 14. and I would as unwillingly contradict either of these Evangelists as St. *John*. But I see no occasion for contradicting either; for do but admit, which I think cannot with any reason be denied, that St. *Andrew* first met with our Lord and was admitted a Disciple; but withal, that he was not invested first in the Apostolate, but his Brother (*a*) St. *Peter*, as these Evangelists teach in the places I mention'd, and the Difficulty is presently over. And yet farther, if I should admit *Primum* to be an *Adjective* as you would have it, though you can never prove it so, you could never make more of it than that St. *Peter*, whether (*b*) as eldest of

(*a*) Hence he is stiled Ἀπαρχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων, the *first Fruits of the Apostles*, by *Modestus* Arch-bishop of *Jerusalem*; apud *Phot.* Biblioth. Cod. 275. And *Theophylact*, speaking of him and his Brother St. *Andrew*, says, προτίθησι δὲ Πέτρον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν διὸν καὶ πρωτόκλητοι, *he gives the Preference to* Peter *and* Andrew, *because they were first called*, in loc. (*b*) Ætati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat. *B. Hierom. c. Jovin.* l. 1. c. 14. Primum decuit respondere, ut idem esset ordo responsionis, qui erat honoris, & ipse antecedere confessione, qui antecedebat ætate. *Cassian.* de Incarn. Dom. l. 3. c. 12.

the

the Apostles, or because of his free Confession of our Saviour, or for whatever other Cause, was to have a Primacy of Order amongst them, which we are willing to allow him; but which will by no means answer your Claim of an universal Supremacy, or a Supream Authority over the whole Church of Christ; so that you may easily perceive how grosly you was mistaken in asserting St. *Cyprian* to have *positively own'd* the Supremacy of St. *Peter*. Whereas in reality he only teaches that St. *Peter* was call'd first to be an Apostle, and tho' perhaps he had a Primacy of Order in the Apostolical Colledge, yet this is more than St. *Cyprian* asserts, and if he had asserted it as he does not, it would by no means infer the Supremacy your Church so zealously contends for. In a Word, this Father is of no use to you in owning S. *Peter* was *called first*, but is plainly against you in saying he did not *insolently and arrogantly assume any thing to himself, as if he had a Superiority over the rest*, or in your own Words, if you can make any advantage of them, *so as to say he had the Primacy, and that he ought to be obeyed by the recentest and last Apostles.*

R. C. The Deacon's Words are also falsified, *Ibid.*

C. E. I hope no more than St. *Cyprian's*, and then we are safe enough.

R. C. He only says St. Paul *knew himself to be equal in the* Assurance of his Election; that is, *chosen by Christ as infallibly to the Apostleship as any of the Twelve.*

C. E. This is great News to me, for I thought *sciens se non imparem*, had denoted St. *Paul's* full Assurance that he was truly equal to St. *Peter*, and consequently was *invested with an equality of Power*. And if so, pray where is the Falsification you so much complain of?

R. C. Do you make nothing then of these words, *Fiduciâ electionis suæ*, in assurance of his Election?

C. E. I see you make a great deal of them, or else you would not complain so of Mis-translation; but I doubt you will not get much by them. For all I can understand by them is, that St. *Paul in the assurance of his Election* to the Apostolate, *that is to say, being fully* assured that he was elected to be an Apostle, as certainly as any of the rest, hereby knew that he was not inferiour to St. *Peter*. This I take to be the Deacon's undoubted Meaning, and you may try either to prove it is not, or to shew it does not directly make against you.

R. C. Dr. *Barrow* it seems is against you, for he renders the Words thus, *Who durst resist Peter the first Apostle, to whom our Lord did give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, but such an one, who in assurance of his Election knowing himself not to be unequal to him, might constantly disprove what he had unadvisedly done?*

C. E. Though I cannot but think the Doctor would render *improbaret*, *disapprove*, rather than *disprove*; yet the rest of the Translation I am ready to take upon Content; for I cannot find it in the 78th Page of my Edition. And now let us see what you will get by it. There is no difference so much as pretended between the Dr. and the *Vindicator*, in any part of the Sentence, save only in these words, *Qui fiduciâ Electionis suæ sciens se non imparem*, which you take to mean no more than that St. *Paul knew himself to be chosen by Christ as infallibly to the Apostleship, as any of the twelve*. But does Dr. *Barrow* say so too? By no means. He only says of that Apostle, *who in assurance of his Election, knowing himself to be not unequal to him*, &c. as much as to say, who being fully

fully assur'd of his Election to the Apostolate, knew himself to be not unequal to St. *Peter*. This I look upon as the propereſt meaning of the Doctor's Words, as it is also of the *Vindicator's*; and I cannot possibly see therefore wherein the Falsification lies, unless on your own side; or why the *Vindicator* does not still entirely retain his right to the Title of *Philalethes*.

R. C. Mr. *L.* says, *it little became the other Apostles, to send their Sovereign upon Business, as they sent* Peter *to* Samaria, *Act.* 8. 14. whereas *in publick* Concerns it is not an unusual thing, for the whole Body to depute their Superior, p. 49.

C. E. Supposing the Superior offer himself to go and intercede for them, or any way to treat in their behalf, it is not to be suppos'd his Inferiors should refuse to accept of his Kindness, and publickly to testify their Concurrence with him. But this is not properly to send him. And this I take to be all that was in the Case of *Ishmael's* and his Companions Expedition to *Nero* in behalf of the *Jews*, as *Josephus* relates it, *Antiq.* l. 20. c. 7. And yet I dare undertake you cannot give an instance of a *Pope's* being ever thus sent by those under his Charge. And is it not exceeding strange then, that St. *Peter* from whom the Popes profess to derive all their Power, should have been sent in such a manner by his known Inferiors and Subjects? Nothing can be said for it, but only that you and your Friends are resolved it shall be so.

R. C. Mr. *L.* argues; *do you think one could write the History of King* Charles the IId *and neither call him King, nor tell of any regal Act he ever did*; and then tells us, *in the History which we have of the Acts of the Apostles, there is no evident instance of* St. Peter's *Supremacy*, p. 49.

C. E.

C. E. Upon this you take occasion to enlarge for three or four Pages together; where yet you offer nothing but what is easily answer'd, but there being nothing in them that relates to the *Vindicator*, I pass them over as not to my present purpose, nor suiting with my intended Brevity.

R. C. Mr. *L.* puts us next in mind of the Council at *Jerusalem* related, *Act.* 15. *where* he says *both of them were present, and there is not a tittle of any Superiority of St.* Peter *over St.* Paul, adding moreover very confidently, that St. *James*, the Bishop there, did, as President, resume what had been said by St. *Peter* and others, and gave his definitive Sentence upon the whole; and the Decree was drawn up in *his Words*, p. 53.

C. E. From hence you seek to impose upon the Reader, with an imaginary Pretence of the *Jewish* Christians accusing St. *Paul* as a Deceiver, who taught false Doctrine at *Antioch*, and an Agreement hereupon on both sides to refer the Case to the Church of *Jerusalem*, not to a Synod of the Apostles, and not as Judges impower'd by our Saviour to issue out Orders in Cases of this nature, but only as Arbitrators chosen by the Persons concern'd, and who refer'd their Cause to them; which I call an imaginary Pretence, because we find nothing of it in St. *Luke's* Relation of this Synod. Nor could the *Restater* pick any thing out of it; for (*a*) he readily owns it to have been an Apostolical Council, and pleads though to little purpose, (as the *Vindicator* (*b*) has plainly shewn, and you have not attempted to answer him,) that St. *Peter* presided in it. The *Vindicator* has added besides, a Question which you will not quickly answer. (*c*) *What Promise*

(*a*) *Case Restated*, p. 18, 19. (*b*) *Case truly stated*, p. 36. 37, 38, 39, 40 (*c*) 40, 41.

have

have you, that whosoever should preside in that Council, should be supreme Pastor of the whole Church? Or *what other Title to this Supremacy can you plead, from what was said or acted therein? It is matter of Fact, that you will not allow St.* James *such a supereminent Jurisdiction, though* says he, *I have prov'd him to have presided there. And it is too much to expect it to be yielded to St.* Peter, *whom I have prov'd to have been, and acted there, only as as Fellow Apostle.* This he said in answer to the Restater, who would needs have this Council prove the Supremacy of St. *Peter*, against which he argu'd as in the Words but now cited. And you neither own him to have been mistaken, though by your manner of proceeding you must be of Opinion that he was so; nor do you undertake to support his Plea. But to make amends for this Defect, you have brought a heavy Charge against the *Vindicator*.

R. C. *The* Vindicator *here in one Sentence gives us a double Cast of this Art*, p. 59.

C. E. Then you have discover'd him to be grown a notable Man at Trick and Artifice, that he should give you a double Experiment of it in one Breath; and no doubt in some matter of mighty Consequence, because otherwise it were not worth his while to run the Hazard of exposing himself so shamefully.

R. C. 1st, *Instead* of he [meaning *James* the Bishop of *Jerusalem*] *he puts* this Apostle, *ibid.*

C. E. A wonderful Cast of his Art! Being the very same thing that St. *Paul*, I hope without any *Cast of Art*, says, *Gal.* 1. 19. in these words, *other of the Apostles saw I none, save* James *the Lord's Brother.* I humbly conceive St. *Paul* may have the favour of being excused for calling St. *James* an Apostle; but for the poor *Vindicator*, it was certainly *a Cast of his Art*, and not to be forgiven. *Non quod dissimilis res est, sed quod qui facit.*

facit. The Egregiousness of this Artifice may be learnt also from *Clemens Alexandrinus* in the 6th and 7th Books of his *Hypotyposeis*, or more readily from *Eusebius*, *H. Eccle.* l. 2. c. 1. But enough of this, if not too much for an Objection no better founded, and of no more consequence to the matter in Hand.

R. C. 2*dly*, He translates μεγάλη greater, *which every School-Boy knows to be wrong*, Ibid.

C. E. It is true, *every School-Boy* knows μεγάλη is not μείζων, and so this is not a literal rendring of the Word. But I suppose the *Vindicator* did not think himself oblig'd any more than others, to keep always to the Letter of his Author, so he but took care to keep to his Sense. And this I think he has truly done, but if you can shew he has not, you have my free Consent to chastise him as severely as you please.

R. C. The *Vindicator* (*a*) cites *Hesychius* of *Jerusalem* saying, in relation to the Council that we have been disputing about, Πέτρος διαλέγεται, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβος νομοθετεῖ &c. Peter *speaches it, but St. James determines, and his Determination was not to be set aside, nor his Sentence to be slighted.*

C. E. But you have a short answer for him, and full of Contempt. *For the Declamation of* (*b*) Hesychius---*it is not worth taking notice of*, p. 60. No besure, since it is directly against you, it is but fit to throw it aside, as of no Consideration; which is a very expeditious way of answering,

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 40. (*b*) Of *Hesychius* you say, *whom some place in the fifth Century*; Mr. *Du Pin in the 6th and 7th.* By which I cannot tell what you mean, unless you would have it thought, that he was of too late a standing to have any regard paid to his Authority. And yet I cannot tell how to believe this, when you make no difficulty of quoting others as late; and even St. *Bernard*, who liv'd twice as long after our Saviour as *Hesychius* is thought by some to have done.

and

and must necessarily be exceedingly satisfactory to an inquisitive Reader. But it is only to satisfy him, that you have nothing to reply to so pat and clear an Evidence on our side. But if *Hesychius* though a Patriarch be below your Notice, why must the great St. *Chrysostom* be so too? The *Vindicator* had appeal'd to St. *Chrysostom* as well as *Hesychius* for the proof of St. *James*'s presiding in the Council at *Jerusalem*, and they having both declared it so plainly, that you knew not what Reply to make to them, the Testimony of one you call a Declamation, and slightingly say it is not worth taking notice of, and the other you take no notice at all of, as if the *Vindicator* had never mention'd him. And this perhaps you may call answering. But had the *Vindicator* been guilty of such unfair Dealing, it is easy to guess what you would have said of him.

R. C. Mr. *L. says*, In this Council there is not a tittle of any Superiority of St. *Peter* over Saint *Paul*. *Then 'tis likely St.* Peter *came not to give his Vote; which yet the* Vindicator *is pleas'd to allow him*, p. 62.

C. E. So far as I can trace out the *Vindicator's* Mind, I am not at all sensible that he had the least thought of your Dream about St. *Paul's* Tryal at *Jerusalem*, with which you have made such a pother; but only that being conciliarily assembled, they issued forth a Determination, as to what Observations the *Gentiles* were oblig'd to submit to; namely, that they should *abstain from Meats offer'd to Idols, from Blood, from things strangled, and from Fornication*, Act. 15. 29. Which was the proper business of a Council, and shews they met for the Instruction of the Church committed to their Charge, and neither as Judges of St. *Paul*, nor Arbitrators betwixt him and the *Jews* at *Antioch*, as you would have it thought, but without any reason for it.

R. C. The Vindicator *has found out a new Answer*, p. 45. *The Bishops in the Council of* Chalcedon, *an.* 451. say, *The Patriarchal* Privileges were given to *Rome* by the Fathers, because it was the Imperial City, p. 85.

C. E. And are they not the very Words of the Canon?

R. C. St. *Leo* would never approve this Canon, *Ibid.*

C. E. If by *approving*, you mean he would not confirm it, as I suspect you do; the *Vindicator* (*a*) has told you from *Eusebius*, *Sozomen*, and Mr. *Justell*, that he had no such Power of Confirmation. And so there was no need of it. But why would he not *approve this Canon?*

R. C. Because it was repugnant to the more ancient Council of Nice, *in making* Constantinople *a Patriarchal See, and giving it the Preference before* Alexandria *and* Antioch, *Ibid.*

C. E. Will you please then to prove that an Oecumenical Council had not a Power to erect a Patriarchate, where they should see it proper; or to assign its Place and Order? Otherwise you can never defend Pope *Leo*'s refusal in this respect. And yet could this have been done, what were it to the Point we are upon, of *Romes* having a Primacy, or Precedence of all other Patriarchates granted it, because of its being *the Imperial City*, *διὰ τὸ βασιλίδιον τῆς πόλεως εἶναι*?

R. C. But the Pope's Patriarchal Dignity *is not his* Supremacy, *Ibid.*

C. E. But it is all the Dignity the Council attributed to him; who knew nothing of your imaginary Supremacy.

R. C. In the sixth Century the Emperor Justinian *says*, We decree according to the Decisions of the four holy Councils, that the most holy Pope of

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 47.

Old

Old *Rome*, take place of all other Bishops; and the most blessed Arch-bishop of *Constantinople*, the *New Rome*, hold the second Rank, and be prefer'd before all others, *Ibid.*

C. E. And is not this a farther Confirmation of the Bishop of *Rome's* having his Precedence given him, not by virtue of a suppos'd Supremacy, but out of regard to the Imperial City?

R. C. I have not pretended to deny that. But only I take notice that the *Vindicator* says, *Which Constitutions I take to explain that of* Irenæus, *and that* propter potentiorem principalitatem, *signifies* the peculiar Power and Privileges of *Rome*, given it by Councils and Emperors, *Ibid.*

C. E. This is personal, and affects the *Vindicator* himself, more than the Cause we are upon. And if he has not express'd himself as he ought to have done, I hope that without Offence I may take the liberty to put his Argument in a better Light, thus; *which Constitutions I take to explain* Irenæus's Potentiorem Principalitatem, *since it is upon the same reason, that the peculiar Power and Privileges of* Rome, *have been since given it by Councils and Emperors.* The *Vindicator's* Design was only to shew that the Respect paid to the See of *Rome* in *Irenæus's* Time, and the Privileges confer'd upon it since by Councils and Emperors, were upon the account of that Cities being the Head of the Empire, and the Seat of the Emperor. And this being once clear'd, it matters not much, as to the Cause we are upon, whether the *Vindicator* had express'd himself so cautiously as he ought to have done or not. So that upon the whole, for ought I can see, the Proof of St. *Peter's* Supremacy lies yet upon your hands, and is as far from being made out, as when you first began.

R. C. *S. Prosper's* Testimony the *Vindicator* excepts to, because it is a Poem, *so are the* Psalms, p. 89.

C. E. But the *Vindicator* tells you farther, *(a)* that *Poets and Panegyrists being wont frequently to give a loose to their Fancies, you cannot build much upon a particular Phrase or Expression in them; And accordingly their unusual Flights are never to be reckon'd upon, as of equal Authority with the plain Expressions of graver and more instructive Writers.* Then he proceeds to a more particular Consideration of the Words of *Prosper*, to shew they do not bear what you would have infer'd from them. And to this you say nothing, except that the *Psalms are a Poem*; though I hope all Poems are not to be compar'd with these, and that *Prosper's* was a *Dogmatical Poem*, and which Mr. *Du Pin* professes to be *the most considerable Piece, which* S. Prosper *composed about Grace.* Which is no answer at all to the *Vindicator's* Assertions, that Poetical Flights are often times to have an allowance made for them; and that besides the Words consider'd in themselves do not answer your Expectation.

R. C. *What* Prosper *said in Verse, St.* Leo *deliver'd from the Pulpit,* Ibid.

C. E. And what says the *Vindicator* here?

R. C. *The* Vindicator *cries out it is a Panegyrick,* p. 90.

C. E. And is it not?

R. C. *But it is not a Panegyrick upon the City of* Rome, *Ibid.*

C. E. Does a Panegyrist then, never lanch out upon any other matter, but that which is the principal subject of his Oration?

R. C. Besides this, *it is looked upon with a great deal of Reason, as one of the best Sermons of St.* Leo, Ibid.

(a) *Case truly stated*, p. 50, 51.

C. E.

C. E. You cannot take this for a Proof, that he had no hyperbolical Expressions in it. And yet unless it were, it is not at all to the purpose. But let me tell you farther; the *Vindicator* not only puts you in mind, that this is a Panegyrical Oration; (*a*) but moreover that in this same Discourse *Leo* speaks *of such a Parity between St.* Peter *and St.* Paul, *as cannot well consist with a Supremacy in the one, and Subjection in the other*; and again, that *Cardinal* Cusanus *affirms of this same* Leo, *that he has freely own'd* all good Bishops *to be* the Successors of St. *Peter*; *and by Consequence, that this Succession, either conveys no Supremacy, and so the Pope has not a Title to it upon this account, or else conveys too much, and so* all good Bishops *must have it. Either of which Suppositions quite overthrows your Hypothesis*, and at length concludes, *Were I to give you up this Pope, as an avow'd Advocate for the universal Supremacy, the Sum of all were only this; that by the fifth Century you have found one Christian Writer, a* Roman *Bishop, and so speaking for himself, who in a Rhetorical Oration, declared for the Supremacy of St.* Peter's *Seat, and the Glory of* Rome *upon that account.* To all which you give not one word of answer.

R. C. *The same Saint writing to* Anastasius, *Bishop of* Thessalonica, *whom he had made his Deputy*, **to help the Care**, says he, **which we owe to all Churches principally by Christ's Institution**; he observes that among the Apostles, **tho' there was a like Honour, there was a certain difference in their Power.** That accordingly there is a Distinction of Bishops; *and that* it was very well ordain'd, that the Bishops of greater Cities, should have a more extensive Charge, by whom the Care of the whole Church might flow to the See of

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 52.

Peter

Peter only, so that no part should disagree from its Head, p. 90. 91.

C. E. Yet after all I see nothing here that may not be answer'd from what has already been said in the third Section, p. 31, &c. and thither therefore I refer the Reader.

SECT. VI.

R. C. I Proceed next to consider some Objections of the Vindicator, and to shew how weak and incompetent they are, as to the purpose they were brought for.

C. E. Be pleas'd then to let us have them, and to see how effectually you will be able to demolish them.

R. C. His first Objection, p. 7. (which is also Dr. *Barrow's*) *is, that the Council of* Chalcedon, *Can.* 28. *gives* Constantinople *and* Rome *equal* Privileges, *τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, because they are both Imperial Cities*, p. 104.

C. E. And a material Objection it is in my Opinion. He gives you also the Sense (*a*) of *Nilus* of *Thessalonica* as to this Point, namely, *that we learn from hence, that the Pope had his Primacy above other Churches given him, not by the Apostles, but by the Fathers. And that it was because* Rome *was the Imperial City.* He advises his Reader also to consult *Barlaam* to the same purpose, and *Sozomen.* And it is to be presumed you take particular care to confute these.

R. C. I take no notice of any of them; but I tell you, which may serve as well, that the *Canon* can affect *only the Patriarchal Privileges of* Rome *over those Provinces, which had a special Dependence upon it; but this without the help of a* Petitio

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 1.

Principii

Principii (*that is without supposing the Question, and taking that for granted which is the whole subject of the Dispute*) *will not hurt the Supremacy.*

C. E. This is very strange. For if what Privileges it has were given it by the Fathers, and only in Consideration of its being *the Imperial City*, this utterly overthrows your Pretence of an universal Supremacy deriv'd to it from St. *Peter.*

R. C. *Though St.* Peter's *Successor had neither been a* Patriarch, *nor even a* Metropolitan, *he would have had that* Supremacy, *that was given to Saint* Peter *before he was either of them*, Ibid.

C. E. This is a *Petitio Principii* with a witness, where because you have not been able to prove the Supremacy you pretend to, you courageously suppose it, and then set your own groundless supposal in Opposition to an unanswerable Argument against it. And if this be your way of answering Objections, you may soon get rid of them all with a wet Finger. The *Canon* gives not the least Intimation of any *Privileges* more than *Patriarchal* belonging to *Rome*, and had the Pope then fancied to himself such a supream Jurisdiction, as you now fancy for him, he would never have been contented with the Council's comparing his Privileges with those of his Subjects. Nor is it reasonable to suppose the Council would ever have enacted a Canon so much to his Detriment, as this would have been, but that they were well assur'd he had no other Privileges above other Bishops, but what belong'd to him as a Patriarch and Metropolitan, and these given him too because of the Glory of the City wherein he presided. So that in your own Words I may return this Answer: *You can never get any thing by your own answer to this Objection, unless you suppose the Bishop of* Rome *had a Jurisdiction beyond his Patriarchate; that is, unless you suppose that which is the only thing in*

Que-

Question. I add, and whereof the Fathers assembled at *Chalcedon* shew themselves to have had no Notion.

R. C. The Vindicator objects 2dly p. 42. *That it is a great Absurdity, that after St.* Peter's *Death,* Linus *or* Clemens, *who at most were only Disciples, should have Jurisdiction over St.* John *the Evangelist. But if we must believe nothing that is strange, (though a Consequence either of Scripture or of Apostolical Tradition) we must bid adieu to Christian Religion,* p. 105.

C. E. Here you proceed again upon a meer supposal, without any Proof, of Scripture and Apostolical Tradition being for this Supremacy. Whereas nothing of this yet appears, and the Absurdity here objected is a considerable Argument against it, being such as is not easy to be believ'd without some better Evidence for the Truth of the Fact than we have yet met with. Nor will your Instances at all answer the Objection. That the blessed Virgin should be subject to the Apostles in matters Spiritual and Ecclesiastical, which was the proper matter of their Office, is not at all strange to me, how unaccountable soever you may apprehend it to be. And that our Blessed Lord himself should condescend during his Minority, to be subject to his Mother, was but what became him who was (*a*) *to fulfil all Righteousness*; and what therefore you need not be exceedingly surpriz'd at, considering the manner and design of this Incarnation, and to how much lower a Degree he was graciously pleas'd to humble himself for our Redemption. Nor will his unparallelled Goodness in so debasing himself for our Sakes, ever prove it reasonable to suppose an Apostle subjected to the Dominion of one who was only a Bishop, though it were him of the See of *Rome*.

(*a*) *Matt.* 3. 15.

R. C.

R. C. Objection III. p. 42. *Is the Authority of a Discourse printed at* Cologne, *Anno* 1681. *called* Moiens sûres, *&c. whose Author was of the* Vindicator's *Religion; so that the* Case truly stated *may be objected as well as* Moiens sûres, *p.* 105, 106.

C. E. We have been told, as I have noted before, that this Treatise had the Approbation of the Archbishop of *Tholouse*, which I should think to be at least, a competent proof of it's being written by one of your selves. And what Evidence do you produce to the contrary? Truly none at all. You flatly deny it; but it is too much to expect, that you should undertake to give your Reasons for denying it. Only he does not please you, and is therefore to bear *Rigaltius* company, and be given up for a *Protestant in Masquerade.*

R. C. He says Cardinal Cusanus *confirms what S.* Gregory *had told us before, that the Three first Patriarchs of* Rome, Alexandria *and* Antioch, *and all the Bishops that were under them, sate in S.* Peter's *Chair. Now the Truth is; S.* Peter, *besides his own See at* Rome, *was supposed to have a special regard to* Antioch, *where he once sate; and to* Alexandria, *where his Disciple, S.* Mark, *planted the Gospel.* So that all the Bishops, *and all the Parish-Priests, within those Precincts, succeeded to some part of S.* Peter's *Charge*—— *But as only the Bishops of* Rome *were absolutely and strictly esteemed his Successors; so they only inherited the full Extent of his Jurisdiction.*

C. E. Here you tell us, *S.* Peter *was supposed to have a special regard to* Antioch *and* Alexandria; which you must own is but meer supposal, on which nothing can be built. And if it were manifestly true, how could his regard to those places, when he was settled, as you hold, at *Rome*, make the Bishops there his Successors? They had their proper Patriarchs as well as *Rome*; and whosoever therefore came into those Sees after

these, must be their, and not S. *Peter*'s Successors; as you cannot but be sensible. What then can S. *Peter*'s supposed regard to these places signify, towards making their Bishops his Successors? This is a Discovery, not only new in itself; but besides, which is above my comprehension, and what you will never be able to maintain. But this is not all I have to offer against you here. For thus our Author proceeds, though you have not thought fit to take notice of it; and so the *Vindicator* told you, *Let any one read the Writings of the* Popes, Gregory, Gelasius, *and* Leo, *and he will find they all acknowledge all good Bishops to be S.* Peter's *Successors.* And was this likewise out of a supposed regard for the places where they presided? I dare say you will not pretend it. And yet farther, *Tho' sometimes they have not failed to discover ambitious Inclinations, and a desire of subjecting other Bishops to them, yet not as Heads of the Church, and yet less by virtue of any Text of Scripture. Neither is it to be observed for the first Five Centuries, that any ever had the face to alledge one single Passage in the Sacred Writings, for establishing the Primacy of the Bishop of* Rome. Here are three different Popes cited against you, and in such express terms against your pretended Supremacy, that you had no better way to defend your self against them, but by passing them over in a profound silence, as if the *Vindicator* had never said a word about them. This perhaps may be thought fair dealing on your side; but if the *Vindicator* had done it, he must have expected to hear of it with both Ears.

R. C. Objection IV. p. 44. *In former times Bishops called the Pope* Collegue, Brother, Fellow-Minister, *&c.* p. 106.

C. E. This you cannot possibly deny.

R. C. You see I do not. But then I desire you to observe, that *S.* Paul *calls the* Corinthians

his

his Brothers, *yet exercised a Jurisdiction over them*; And *S.* Peter stiles himself συμπρεσβύτερον, a *Fellow Elder*.

C. E. I see you are sadly put to it, that you can find no better an Answer than this. For the Question is not what either S. *Peter*, or *S. Paul*, or any other Superior stiles himself, but whether his Inferiors and Subjects think it becoming them, to use the same freedom with him. The Pope stiles himself *Servus Servorum Dei*, A Servant of the Servants of God. But I dare answer for you, that if you were to write a Letter to him, you would not allow yourself to send it so superscribed. And I challenge you to produce one Instance of his being applied to by any Bishop, or other of the Clergy, under the Title of *Brother*, or *Collegue*, or any other like familiar Appellation, since his Claim to an Universal Supremacy has been set on foot. Till you can do this, you must own, the Case is very much altered now from what it was formerly; and that this Intimacy and Familiarity with the ancient Popes, is a good Evidence, that they were not then so elevated above the rest of their Brethren, and Fellow-Bishops, as they now take upon them to be.

R. C. Objection V. p. 47. *If the Popes were Supreme Governors of the Church*, the *Vindicator* urges, *they would have had the Right of convening General Councils, which*, says he, *it is certain they had not*. And yet *it is certain they had*, p. 107.

C. E. So you affirm; but you do not undertake to prove it. The Fact, that the Emperors convened the ancient Councils, you do not dispute, nor can you, after all the Evidence he has brought for it. But as you have an excellent Talent at supposing, where you cannot prove, so here *you suppose* the Popes to have had a Right,

of doing it either alone, or together with the Emperors. That is, you would have it believed, without any manner of Proof, that the Popes had a Right of convening Councils, of some sort or other, though you know not what. But the *Vindicator* must be extreamly condescending, if he will take this for an Answer to all the Evidence he has brought to the contrary. Next, you admit the *Fact*, that this *was executed by the Emperor's Letters*; but plead, *that yet the Lawfulness of it might arise, from the Desire of the Bishops themselves, and chiefly of the first See.* Which is a strange sort of arguing, and shews your Case to be very bad. First you say, *It might arise from the Desire of the Bishops themselves*, &c. Where you ought to have remembred, that *à posse ad esse non valet consequentia*; what only may be, may as well not be, and so you have in effect said nothing for your Cause. Next, If it only arose *from the desire of the Bishops themselves, and especially the Pope*, it is a plain acknowledgment that the Power was not then looked upon to be solely in the Pope, as you would have it; for so it would have been an Affront to his Holiness, for the other Bishops to interpose in what was his peculiar priviledge. And lastly, If it arose from the Desire of the Pope, and other Bishops petitioning the Emperor, it evidently follows, that the Power of Convening was then acknowledged, by the Pope, as well as the other Bishops, to be in the Emperor, and not in the See of *Rome*. And so instead of asserting this Right to the Pope, you have been pleased to own it to have been none of his. Farther, you tell us, *the Bishops at* Constantinople, *Anno* 382, *writing to Pope* Damasus, *thanked him for calling them to a Council by the Emperor's Letters.* And it is very kindly done of you, to bring such an instance against yourself. For if the Pope could not

not summon them, but *by the Emperor's Letters*, I may safely refer it to yourself, where the Power of summoning them was owned by all at that time to lye. Your next Citation from *Rufinus* is parallel to this, *That the Emperor called it*, Ex sacerdotum sententiâ, *by the Advice of the Bishops*. Where one would be tempted to think you were writing poory; for if the *Emperor* were the Convener, by whatsoever Advice it were, then not the Pope. You ask farther, *Why had not Bishops as much Right of convening by their own Authority in the Fourth Century, as they had in the First, Second, and Third?* And now I would beg leave in my turn to ask another Question, and leave it with you; which is, Whether this be pleading for the Pope's Supreme Power, or for the Bishops against it? Hereunto you subjoin two Cautions of *Hosius* and S. *Ambrose* to the Emperors *Constantius* and *Valentinian*, against meddling to promote the *Arian* Interest. Which can never prove the Pope's Right to convene Councils, to which they have no more relation, than to the Constitution *Unigenitus*, or Prince *Eugene*'s passing the *Danube*.

R. C. Objection VI. p. 47. *The Pope did not preside in the first general Councils*, p. 109.

C. E. So the *Vindicator* told you. And not only told you so, but referred you (*a*) to *Richerius*, *Labbe* and *Cossartius*, *Sozomen*, *Evagrius*, *Photius*, and *Du Pin*, for the proof of it. And it was to be hoped you would take effectual care to confute all these, and let the Reader see they are quite in the wrong. Whereas on the contrary you pass over them all, as if nothing had been said of them. And so all of them still bear witness against you.

R. C. However, I have brought counter-Evidence, and that is as well.

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 47.

C. E. You

C. E. You ought first to have cleared the way by removing the *Vindicator*'s Testimonies, before you undertook to assert the contrary. But this I find is not your way. And if you are resolved to write to no purpose, who can help it? This may cut out work for an Answerer, but can be for no one's Satisfaction, unless it be by letting the World see, you could not answer them. However, though nothing is said to these, let us hear, if you please, what you have to say besides.

R. C. (*a*) *As to the Fifth Council*, Anno 553. *Eutychius*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, desired of *Vigilius* it might be held, *Præsidente nobis vestrâ beatitudine*, Your Holiness presiding over us. *Ibid.*

C. E. I need not tell you, that *Vigilius* did not preside in it. Nor could he possibly, since he would not be prevailed with to appear there, (*b*) *He consented to the Council by Letter, but would not sit amongst them*; and so cannot so much as be pretended to have presided over them.

R. C. As to the Sixth Action of the Council of Chalcedon, Paschasinus, *the Pope's Legate, subscribed the Definition of Faith, in this manner*; Presiding over the Council, I have approved it, consented to it, and subscribed it. *Ibid.*

C. E. And what if the Pope be supposed to have presided in that Council? The *Vindicator* did not say, that he might not at any time do it, as well as any other Bishop, when called to

(*a*) P. *Maimbourgh*, in his *Prerogatives of the Church of* Rome, *and her Bishops*, p. 54. acknowledges the Pope not to have *presided in the First Council of* Constantinople, *which perhaps neither did he call*; *and that it is most probable he did not call the Fifth, nor presided in it, though he was at* Constantinople, *where that Council was held.*

(*b*) Βιγίλιος μὲν ἐν ἐγγράφῳ συνθήκας συνεδρεῖν οὐκ ἔφασκε. Evagr. Hist. Ecc. l. 4. c. 38. See also *Du Pin* Nouv. Bibl. To. 5. p. 197, 198. in Quarto.

it,

it, but only, that he did not do it constantly, and *in all of them.* And every one knows presiding in one, is not presiding in all; and so is neither any contradiction to his Assertion, nor any proof of a Right of Presidency in the Pope, more than in other Bishops; And yet I cannot suffer my self to yield this one Council to you, because not only *Du Pin* observes, that *Dioscorus* of *Alexandria* presided in it; but moreover, I find, that this *Dioscorus* had the (*a*) Emperor's Commission for it.

R. C. Of the General Council at Ephesus, *Anno* 431, Mennas, *Bishop of* Constantinople, *said;* Pope *Celestin* is known to have presided in it by his Deputies, *Cyril,* Bishop of *Alexandria, Arcadius* and *Projectus* Bishops, and *Philip,* who was a Priest. *Ibid.*

C. E. Whether *Mennas* said these words is more than I know. But I know they are in *Baronius's* Transcript of (*a*) *Vigilius's Constitutum.* And yet I have this to object to them, which you will not easily get over; that not only a Subscription occurs in the Acts of that Council, wherein (*b*) *Juvenalis,* Bishop of *Jerusalem,* stands first, and then *Arcadius* and *Projectus,* two of the Pope's Legates, which would hardly have been, if they had presided there; but besides, S. *Cyril* Subscribed at the End, as (*c*) Bishop of *Alexandria,* and so in his own Right, not in the Pope's; and *Evagrius* plainly tells us (*d*) that he presided there, without the least hint of any Substitution from *Rome.*

(*a*) Τὴν εὐσεβείαν καὶ τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς σῆς θεοσεβείας παρέχομεν. Conc. To. 4 p. 109

(*b*) Anno 553. 51. (*c*) Conc. To. 3. p. 659.

(*d*) Κύριλλος ἐπίσκοπος Ἀλεξανδρείας ὑπάγεται ἀποφαίνων ἅμα τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ.

(*e*) Οἷς ἡγήσατο ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Κύριλλος, ὁ τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων πρόεδρος. Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 18.

R. C. What

R. C. What we call the Second General Council, Anno 381, *or* 382, *if considered in itself, was only an Assembly of Oriental Bishops, as* Theodoret *observes,* Lib. 5. Hist. Cap. 7. *Ibid.*

C. E. Whatsoever sort of Assembly it was, you do not deny that *Nectarius* presided in it. Which is all that is incumbent to me to prove. And yet, whatsoever your private Opinion may be, you cannot but own, that not only the rest of the World, but even those of your own Party, such as *Labbé* and *Cossartius, Binius, Cabassutius, Longus a Coriolano,* &c. have owned it as a General Council. And so your Exception to it comes too late.

R. C. Of the Council at Nice, *Anno* 325, Du Pin *writes thus; 'Tis not certainly known, who presided in this Council; but it is very probable that it was* Hosius, *who held the chief Place there in his own Name,* &c. *Ibid.*

C. E. So it is generally acknowledged; which is enough to shew it was not the Pope. This the *Vindicator* had urged *(a)* before, and you have not known how to contradict him.

R. C. Be not too sure of that, Sir; for *Gelasius Cizicenus says,* Hosius *was one of the Legates of Pope* Silvester. Hincmar, *Archbishop of* Reims, *was of this Opinion,* p. 110.

C. E. It is not enough, that they were of his Opinion, unless they would give their Reasons for it. It is a very good Reason against them, that *Hosius's* Name stands in the Head of the Subscriptions, as the *Vindicator* has told you *(b)* already, and *Victor* and *Vincentius,* the Pope's Legates next after him.

R. C. Socrates *reckons the Pope's Legates before the* Oriental *Patriarchs, and so they stand in the Subscriptions of the Council.* Ibid.

(a) *Case truly stated,* p. 47. (b) Ibid.

C. E. What

C. E. What is this to *Hosius*, who was a *Spanish* Bishop, and no *Orientalist*? Their coming after the Legates will never prove that he was not before them; as you must necessarily confess.

R. C. Hosius *could not preside by any Right of his See, which was* Corduba, *a private Bishoprick in* Spain, *under* Seville *as its Metropolis.* Ibid.

C. E. It answers our purpose, that he sate there not as the Pope's Legate. Nor was it ever pretended, that I know of, that it was upon the account of his See. But whether it were that he was appointed by the Emperor, or chosen to it by the Bishops, upon the account of his personal Merit, or however it came to pass; this is a sufficient proof, that to preside there, was not looked upon as a peculiar Right of the *Roman* See; and by consequence, that the Pope was not then believed to have the Supremacy since contended for. Which was all the *Vindicator* aimed at in this Instance; and wherein he does not yet at all appear to have been mistaken.

R. C. The VIIth and VIIIth Objections are, *That* Appeals *from all places have not constantly been held to belong of Right to the Pope:* and not the Popes, but *the Emperors confirmed the Decrees of Councils*; p. 110 and 112.

C. E. Neither of these Assertions you do in the least deny: And so there needs no farther proof of either of them.

R. C. *The* Vindicator *adds*, p. 53. *That S.* Augustin *was stiled by S.* Paulinus, Summus Christi Pontifex, *Christ's chief High-Priest. But this is not much.*

C. E. If it had been spoken of the Pope, it would have had its weight; but because said of another Bishop, *it is not much.* Yet it is so much, as to shew, that such Expressions as these, when

applied to the Pope, will not prove such a Supremacy in him, as those of your own Persuasion are desirous to support by them; if they knew but how. Some other Instances, to the like effect, are brought also by the *Vindicator*, in the same *Page*. But because you found they were against you, you thought it your wisest way to pass them over in silence. And so they stand yet as Witnesses against you.

R. C. He tells us also, p. 54. *that in the Sixth Century*, Avitus, *Bishop of* Vienna, *writing to the Bishop of* Jerusalem *says, his* Apostleship exercises the Primacy granted him by God; and studies to let the World see, that he possesses the chief place in the Universal Church, *p.* 112.

C. E. The *Vindicator* proceeds, though you have not thought fit to take notice of it, (*a*) "If this had been said of the Bishop of *Rome*, how would you have pleased yourselves with it? It would have done you more Service, than what you have collected, from either *Prosper* or *Leo*, which shews how little stress is to be laid upon either of their Assertions". To this latter part you say nothing at all; and to the former you only plead, That *he was Bishop of* Jerusalem, *where Christ lived and shed his Blood. In which respect it was doubtless the chief place in the Universe. Yet this neither gave the Bishop* Supremacy, *nor* a Primacy of Order. *He was not so much as a* Metropolitan, *in the Fourth Century; and had never a higher Rank afterwards, than that of the least of the Patriarchs.* So that, by your own confession, these sort of Titles, and Expressions, do not import any sort of Supremacy, to those to whom they are attributed. And yet how great a part of your Evidences, for the Popish Supremacy, is made up of them. The

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 54.

short of the matter is, that in your way of arguing, when spoken of the Pope, they are plain Proofs for his Universal Jurisdiction; but when said of any one else, they prove no *Supremacy*, nor perhaps so much as a *Primacy of Order*. Which all the World would think a very odd procedure in any other Case; and must accordingly be so in this.

SECT. VII.

R. C. What have you farther to say?

C. E. All that farther remains, according to my first Proposal, is to take notice of, and answer some few other Reflections, that here and there occur against the *Vindicator*, as I meet with them, together with some others, that occur in the Preface to your first Part; and so to conclude the whole.

R. C. Will you please to let us have your Thoughts of them, as briefly as conveniently you can.

C. E. I will be sure to do it, for I want to be at liberty.

R. C. *Vind.* p. 44. S. *Cyprian* said to his Bishops present, in the Council of *Carthage*, "None of us makes himself Bishop of Bishops, or compels his Colleguer, by a tyrannical Power, to a necessity of obeying; seeing every Bishop is at his own disposal, according to the extent of his Liberty and Power; and can no more be judged by another, than he can judge another." p. 122.

C. E. And what have you to object to this?

R. C. Two Things. The first is, That S. *Augustin supposes he meant Questions of this kind*, which are not justly and throughly discussed, &c. p. 123.

C. E. Excellently well answered. You do

not disputed the Truth of the Citation, but both you and S. *Augustin* acknowledge and confirm it; only you bring in S. *Augustin* testifying what Causes he thought S. *Cyprian* and the Bishops were to judge of. Which is perfectly besides the Question. S. *Cyprian* speaks of the Persons that were to be the Judges, and the Relation they stood in to each other; and you cite S. *Augustin* speaking of the nature of the Causes to be judged by them; as if we were at cross Questions.

R. C. But this is only my first Exception: I more farther, that what the *Vindicator* renders *according to the Extent of his Liberty and Power*, is in S. *Cyprian*, *Pro licentiâ libertatis & potestatis*; words which Dr. *Barrow* rightly translates, *Upon the account of his Liberty and Power*. Ibid.

C. E. I am not convinced that the *Vindicator's* Translation of the word *Licentia*, in this place, is not at least as proper, as that of Dr. *Barrow*. But if this please you better, pray take it, and make your best of it. S. *Cyprian* in either Case is equally against you. The *Vindicator* immediately added another Authority, which you thought best to be buried in silence; namely, S. *Augustin seems to have apprehended no such difference between the forementioned* Stephen *and* S. Cyprian, *when he says*, They were two Bishops of most eminent Churches, the *Roman* and the *Carthaginian*. And in truth, it would seem very strange, if any one of your Communion, having occasion to speak of the Bishop of *Rome*, and of *Rome*, or *Italy*, should make no more difference between them, than to say, They were two Bishops of most eminent Churches. But it seems this was no nice propriety in S. *Cyprian's* time, how much soever it be so now.

R. C. The *Vindicator* proceeds, p. 46. S. *Cyprian*, Lib. de unit. Eccl. *positively asserts, that what* S. Peter

S. Peter was, the James also were the other Apostles endued with like Authority of Honour and Power.

Q. And does not S. *Cyprian* say so?

A. Yes, most certainly. Wherefore my Charge against the *Vindicator*, in this place, is not for any thing he says, but for what he does not say. *Why did not the* Vindicator *deal so fairly with his Readers as to let him know the very nice words of* S. Cyprian? It is not impossible to guess. *For the words immediately following are these, in the* Oxford *Edition, But the Beginning springs from an Unity, that the Church may be shewed to be one ... Him* Philalethes *is proved in on all sides. For the words immediately foregoing were these;* Yet Christ to shew the Unity of the Church, ordered, by his own Authority, that one should be the Original of that very Unity, *p.* 124.

C. E. He is sadly penn'd in indeed! But wherein lies his Fault. He was treating about the Equality of the Apostles, and cites S. *Cyprian* to justify it, as he does it very plainly; and you quarrel with him, for not leaving the Subject he was then upon, to relate what S. *Cyprian* says at the same time, concerning the Unity of the Church. That is to say, you know not how to forgive him, only because he would keep to the Argument he was engaged in, and not impertinently run off to another. But others, it is to be hoped, will not condemn him for sticking to the Business he was upon, though you are pleased to do it. Yet had the *Vindicator* been as faulty here as you would have him thought to have been, it would very ill have become you to charge him with it as you do; who in the first Part of the *True Church shewn*, &c. *p.* 27. giving an account of *Baronius's* Recantation, in the Year 1095. have these words, *That Bread and*

Wine.

Wine, when they are consecrated upon the Altar, are truly and essentially changed into the Body and Blood of our Lord; but take care to conceal the very next words, wherein the Recantor professes then, *to be truly handled by the Priest, and broken, and chewed by the Teeth of the Faithful*. Sed in vestrae manibus Sacerdotum tractari, & fidelium dentibus atteri. *Baron. Annal* 105. n. 13. Which being much more to the purpose we were here treating of, than what you charge as an Omission in the *Vindicator* was to his, I hope I may fairly be excused, if I take the liberty of laying in your own words, why this was done. *It is not impossible to guess.*

R. C. But what can you say to what follows in the next Paragraph. *This Authority over the other Apostles*, you say, *Christ promised*, S. Matt. xvi. 16. 18. *But he did not give it the first day of his Resurrection*, S. John xx. 21. *When he said*, As my Father hath sent me, so do I send you; Receive ye the Holy Ghost, &c. *For the Power which he gave his Apostles by these words, was equal. But in the last Apparition, described by S. John, Chap. xxi. 15, 16, 17. he fulfilled his Promise*, p. 114.

C. E. There is nothing in these words, but has been sufficiently consider'd already, and shewn to be far from answering your high Pretences; which are much better presumed, than proved from these, or any other words in Scripture, or from S. *Cyprian*, or any other of the Primitive Fathers. *This Authority over the other Apostles, you say, Christ promised*, S. Matt. xvi. 18. But I have told you, I can find no such Promise in the words. Our Saviour promises there, that S. *Peter*, (supposing him, and not rather his Faith or Confession, or our Lord Christ, whom he thus confessed, to be the Rock here spoken of; though you have seen, that many of

the

the Fathers had not this Notion of our Saviour's Promise; upon this Supposition, I say, our Saviour may justly be concluded to promise those, that S. Peter should be first employed in laying the Foundation of his Church amongst both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, as he certainly did. And you have attempt made, nor will ever be able really to make more of this Promise. And yet till you can do it, it is but vain to depend upon this as a full proof of what it does not prove at all. In the next place, you freely own our Saviour's Commission given to his Apostles, was equal to them all, when *he sent them forth, even as his Father had sent him.* But then you would needs have a Supremacy conferred upon this Apostle in our Saviour's Command to him, *to feed his Lambs and his Sheep.* Yet how far these words are from conferring any such Authority to him, I have already shewn, and shall not trouble the Reader, with a needless Repetition. Only, before I proceed, I beg liberty to observe one turn of your Pen, in p. 123. An Instance of the like nature we had before, where you are pleased to interpret *Originem* by *Center.* And so here again, when St. *Cyprian* affirms, that *Exordium ab unitate profiscitur*, the Beginning springs from an Unity, as your English it; this does not satisfy you, but that he might seem to speak to your purpose: here in like manner, *Exordium*, which every School Boy knows to signify a *Beginning*, must, against the use of the word in all Authors, be misinterpreted *Center*; that so you may make S. *Peter*, what this Father does not, *The Center of Unity to the other Apostles.* I will not tell you, this is a Case of your Art; but I am very sure, if such a liberty be allowed in interpreting of Authors, it will be impossible for any one to know their

their meaning, that cannot read them in their own Language.

R. C. The *Vindicator* tells us, *p.* 46. that S. *Jerom* says, *Let a Bishop be a Bishop of what Town you please*—— *he is of the same Merit and Priesthood*, p. 126.

C. E. S. *Jerom* certainly says it; and if you have any objection against it, you may try it out with S. *Jerom*; but the *Vindicator* has said no more than he can make good.

R. C. But first, if there was a Difference among the Apostles *themselves; may there not be some among the* Bishops? p. 127.

C. E. That there might be a Primacy, or Precedence, amongst the Apostles, is not denied. But that there was a Difference of Authority, or Jurisdiction, over the rest of them, is what can never be made out; and is therefore justly denied, as being asserted without ground.

R. C. Had all Bishops, in S. Jerom's *time, an equal Jurisdiction? Were there no Metropolitans? no Primates?* Ibid.

C. E. I do not say that. But I must insist upon it, that according to our Saviour's Commission, they are all equal, as the Apostles were. Though this hinders not, but that accidental Differences might arise by Human Institution, setting one of them above another, where it shall appear to be for the good of the Church, and of Religion. Whence came in Metropolitans and Primates, and some of them most probably (*a*)

(*a*) Hence S. *Ignatius* stiles himself ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας. Ep. ad Roman. And it is said of S *John* himself, Τῆς Ἐφεσίων ἀνιλαμβάνεται Μητροπόλεως. Phot. Biblioth. Cod. 254. Ὃς καὶ τίτου τῶν ἐπὶ Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 4. Τῆς Κρήτης μητρόπολις ὅσης τῆς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἐπισκόπους χειροτονοῦσας. Theodoret. in Arg. Ep ad Tit. Εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἐνδόξοις ἐν ἑνὶ αὐτῷ τῷ νήσῳ ἐκκλησίαν ἐπέτρεψεν, οὐκ ἂν τοσούτους ἐπισκόπους κείσιν ἐπέτρεψεν. B. Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Ep. ad Tit.

from

from the many times of the Apostles. But it will not follow from hence, that our Saviour did not give an equal Power to all the Apostles; which is what I am contending for. And accordingly, the same Equality amongst their Successors, as originally conferred by our Saviour upon the Apostles, and so most naturally descending from them to all following Generations, is what an *Jerom* here asserts. This, I say, is S. *Jerom's* Doctrine, That the Power of these several Bishops mentioned by him, was originally, and according to our Saviour's Commission, the same. And now, I refer it to your self, and to your own determination. If this be not his meaning, he phrased to let us know what is. And if it be, you may try then to reconcile it to S. *Peter's* Supremacy, if you can tell how.

Ibid. *It is not the Imperial Greatness, or Riches of* Rome, *that gave it's Bishops their Supremacy.* Ibid. C. E. Then *Irenæus* must have been foully mistaken, when he asserts, that whatsoever Supremacy *Rome* enjoyed, was *propter potenti rem Principalitatem, because of its more powerful Principality*; and the Council of *Chalcedon*, when it taught, that a Primacy of Order was given to the Bishop of *Rome*, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύουσαν τῶν πόλεων ἐκείνην, *because of* Rome *being the Imperial City*. As the *Vindicator* put you in mind, p. 7. of *the Case truly stated*. As also of the Third Canon of the Council of *Constantinople*; together with the Question that *Nilus* of *Thessalonica* raises hereupon. *What else do we learn from hence, but that the Pope had his Primacy above other Churches given him, not by the Apostles, but by the Fathers. And that it was because* Rome *was the Imperial City.* And again, that *Barlaam*, the learned Monk, speaks also to the same purpose. All which might have deserved some Considera-

on; and no doubt would, if you had not found it too hard for you.

R. C. Mr. L. of late, and his Vindicator, *have undertaken to make* S. Gregory *both a good Protestant, and a good Protestant Pope*, p. 129.

C. E. They have both own'd, that he utterly condemned the Title of *Universal Bishop*; as he most certainly did. And if that will make him a Protestant Pope, you may call him so, as oft as you please. I add, if *John* of *Constantinople* meant, by the Title of *Oecumenical Bishop*, no more, but the First Patriarch of the East, as you seem here to admit from Mr. *Du Pin*, p. 130. and was so severely condemned by *Gregory*, only because he apprehended him to aim at advancing himself over the Western, as well as the Eastern Part of Christendom, is it not the same Fault in *Boniface* III. and the Popes since, to advance themselves over the Eastern, as well as the Western Part. Do what I can, I am not able to find out a Difference in the Case, and I shall readily own your Ingenuity, if you can.

R. C. S. *Gregory*, as the *Vindicator* quotes him, p. 8. says, *I boldly affirm, that whosoever calls himself Universal Bishop, or desires to be so called by others, shews himself, by such his Haughtiness, to be a Forerunner of Antichrist, inasmuch as he proudly advantes himself above all others*, p. 133.

C. E. And what is it displeases you here?

R. C. 1. *The Translation is not so exact as it should be.* Ibid.

C. E. Well, let us see then, the great Faults you find in it; and instead of, *Shews himself by such his Haughtiness, to be a Forerunner of Antichrist*, let it be read, *Doth in his Elation forerun Antichrist*; instead of, *inasmuch as he proudly advances himself*, let it be as you would have it, *because he pridingly doth*

set

set himself; and again instead of, *above all others*, render it, if you please, *before all others*. And let the Reader judge what you would get by all this, or wherein lies the Defect of the Translation. All I can find in it is, that you had a mind to present us with a touch of your Critical Skill, how little soever it signified.

R. C. 2. If *John* of *Constantinople* had taken it to mean so as to be *the only Bishop*, or that all other Bishops were *his Vicars*, he might *very well be a Forerunner of Antichrist*, p. 134.

C. E. So likewise, *p.* 8. you affirm, that *Thus the Title cannot, without Blasphemy, be attributed to the Pope.* And yet I have already desired, and now again desire you to consider, whether this has been the Case of none of your Popes; and in particular, whether *Laynez* the *Jesuite*'s Speech, (*a*) in the Council of *Trent*, does not intimate it to have been the Case of *Pius* IV; and how then, by your own Confession, will you bring him off from being *a Forerunner of Antichrist?*

R. C. S. *Jerom*, Ep. 57. *gives the Title of Heretick, to all that wilfully separate themselves from* S. Peter's *See.*

C. E. And very justly he might give the Title of either Heretick or Schismatick, to all that separated from the Church of *Rome*, whilst in the State wherein it was in S. *Jerom*'s time. But since it has admitted of such foul Corruptions, as have render'd it's Communion utterly unlawful, and which can with no safety be complied with, the case is quite changed. And S. *Jerom*, had he lived a little before the Reformation, would have wondered as much to see the World become Popish, as ever he did formerly to see it (*a*) become *Arian*. And instead of condemning

(*a*) F. Paul's *Hist.* l. 7 (*b*) Adv. Luciferianos, *p.* 168. *B.*

a Separation from it, would have been sure to advise to *come out from among them, and be separate.*

SECT. VIII.

R. C. THE *Vindicator* affirms, that *It is too well known to those who have had occasion to travel into* Italy, *and some other Parts, that many counterfeit Miracles are pretended to be wrought on some of our Solemn Festivals, and even by our Priests themselves, in the Publick Church, and in the face of numerous Congregations*, p. 7.

C. E. And are you sure they are not?

R. C. *I answer*, there are *none* such; and tell you *it is directly to the Tune of*

The Truth of my Story, if any Man doubt,
We have Witnesses ready to swear it all out.

C. E. This is a serious and a heavy Charge against you, and I should not have expected you would make a matter of Pleasantry, and a Jest of it. However you positively affirm there are *none*. But this you can never prove, nor is it to be expected from you. But then you ought to consider on the other hand, what Evidence can be required, supposing the Charge to be true, and well grounded. Your own People cannot be expected to publish the Cheat, tho' possibly they may acknowledge it in private Conversation, as a Physician did at *Naples*, to a Friend of mine of unquestionable Veracity; who being at the Solemnity on S. *Januarius*'s Day, when the Saint's Blood, in a Vial, turns Liquid in the sight of the Congregation, enquired of his Friend the Doctor, if he did not believe that might be done by Art, and was assured by him, he knew it might, and could

could do it himself. Now such private Evidence as this you may laugh at, as long as you please: But I am sure you can never justify your doing so, since it is many times the best and only Evidence the thing is capable of, by reason of the great care that is taken amongst you, to prevent a Discovery. And yet, though this be many times the only Evidence that may be had, and just at present I know no better; yet it is no contemptible Argument for proving such false Miracles now; though it is not long since they have been no rarities among you, as the *Vindicator* gives you to see (*a*). Whereto you make no manner of Reply. And many more like Instances might have been added, out of Dr. *Beard's Antichrist the Pope of* Rome, *Part* III. *Chap.* 1. H. Stephens's *Apologie pour Herodote*; Bishop *Moreton's* Appeal, l. 3. c. 19 sect. 4 *Purgatory proved by Miracles*; *The School of the Eucharist*; Dr. *Brevint's* Saul *and* Samuel *at* Endor, *Ch.* 3. *Decrees of Pope* Innocent XI. *concerning the Suppression of an Office of the Virgin* Mary, *and of the Multitude of Indulgences*, p. 3——46. Archbishop *Usher's* Religion of the Ancient *Irish*, p. 71. *Reflections on the Devotions of* Roman *Church*, p. 308, *&c.* Mede's *Apostacy of the latter times*, p. 119. Edit. 3. *N. Lyra* in *Danielem*, c. 14. Sykes's *Bibliotheca novorum Librorum*, to. 5. p. 727, 728. *Sir* James Ware's *hunting the Romish Fox*, Ch. 5. p. 85, &c. *Sir* E. Sandy's *Europæ Speculum*, 167, 168, 169. and *Casaubon's* Epistle ad *Front-Duc.* p. 146, 147. Which places, whosoever shall be at the pains of consulting, will find no cause for your being *sorry* for the *Vindicator*, *to think him so soft, as to believe it.*

R. C. Tho' our Catechisms teach, that Pictures and Images are not to be prayed to, the Vindicator *has*

(*a*) *Case truly stated*, p. 89. 90.

Vouchers

Vouchers for it, such who have been Ear and Eye Witnesses of it, that the ignorant People do it. Ibid.

C. E. And so may any one that converses with those who have been abroad; I am sure I have had it positively affirmed by such; and even here at home, I have heard of the same practice, were it proper to name Persons. And for this, I sincerely give you my word, notwithstanding *the Truth of your Story, &c.* comes in here again, just as pertinently as it did before. And if your *Douay* Catechism, to the Question, *Do Catholicks pray to Images?* answers, *No, by no means*; yet, I presume, you do not imagine, there are none amongst you so ignorant, as not to be able to read that Catechism, nor any who can read it, and yet have not done it. And it is well, if none but the ignoranter sort do it now. That it was not always so, but others have been required to do it formerly in this Nation, is plain from (*a*) the

(*a*) Ex Rot. Claus. de Anno Regni Regis Ricardi II. 19°. m. 18. dors. Memorand. quod primo die Septembris Anno Regni Regis Ricardi II. post Conquestum 19°. *Willm. Dynet, Mich. Taylour, Nith. Poucher, & Willm. Steynour* de *Nottingham* in Cancellar. ipsius Regis personaliter constituti, sacramenta divisim præstiterunt, sub eo qui sequitur tenore.

I William Dynet, *befor yhow worshipful Fader, & Lord Archbishop of* Yorke, *and yhour Clergy, with my free will and full avise do swere to God and all his Seynter, upon his holy Gospells that fro this day forthward I shall worship ymages, with praying and offering to hem in the worshipp of the Seinter: that they be made after. And also I shall nevermor despyse pygremage, ne states of holy Chirche in no degree. And also I shall be buxom to the Lawes of holy Chirche and to yhow as myn Archbishop, and to myn other Ordinares, and Curates, and kepe the Lawes upon my Power and meyntayn hem. And also I shall nevermor meynten, ne techen, ne defenden errours, conclusions, ne techynges of the* Lollards, *ne swyche conclusions and techinges that men clepyth* Lollards Doctrin. *Ne I shall her bookes, ne swych bokes, ne hem, or any suspect or diffamede of* Lollardy *resceive, ne companye — mithal wittingly,*

the Recantation of *William Dynet*, and some others, in the time of *Richard* II. in the *Tower* Records, who swore to God, and all his Saints, thenceforward to worship Images, with Praying and Offering to them, *&c.*

R. C. Having told us, p. 122. *that if our Religion teaches us to argue for the Deists, it must needs be a wicked one, he backs the Supposition with the Authority of a Prelate, whom it was very unbecoming to bear false Witness against his Neighbour*, p. 7.

C. E. So it certainly would have been. But see how positive this worthy Prelate is in it. He does not take up a flying Story, that he had heard from I know not whom, but speaks of his *own certain knowledge*, and pawns his Veracity for the Truth of what he relates. (*a*) *Thus much, to my knowledge, have I seen and heard, since my leaving your Lordship, which I thought very requisite to inform your Grace; for my self would hardly have credited these things, had not mine Eyes seen sure Evidence of the same.* A Testimony so express and positive, that I cannot possibly see how any Man of Can-

---

or defend in the matiers, and if I know any such, I shall withall the hast that I may, do yhewe or else your ser Officers to wyten, and of her bokes. And also I shall excite and stirre alle the to good Doctrine, that I have hindred with myn doctrine up my Power. And also I shall stand to yhour declaration wych es ‡‡ heresy or errour and do thereafter. And also what penance yhe will for that I have don for meynteyning of this fals doctrine——— I shall fulfil it, and I submit me therto up my power. And also I shall make no other glose of this myn oth but as the words stend, and if it be so that I com agayn, or do agayn this oth or any part thereof, I yholde me here ‡‡ coupable as an heretyke, and to forfeit all my goods to the Kings will withouten any other processe of Lawe. And therto I require the Notary to make of all this ‡‡ wych is my will an Instrument agayns me. Et ex abundanti idem *Will. Dynet* eodem die voluit & recognovit quod omnia bona & catalla sua mobilia nobis sint foris facta in casu quo ipse juramentum pred. seu aliqua in eo juramento contenta ‡‡ de cætero contravenerit ullo modo.

(*a*) *Archbishop* Usher's *Life and Letters*, p. 612.

dor and Ingenuity can doubt of it; whether we consider the Eminence of the Writer, and the great Credit due to him, as one that could not easily be imposed upon, nor would suffer himself to impose upon others, and to be sure not upon so dear a Friend as the good Archbishop to whom he wrote it; or the Agents and Emissaries that have from time to time been sent over, to play their Tricks amongst us, whereby to deceive the ignorant and unwary Populace; such as (*a*) *Heath* and *Comyns* (*b*) *Button*, *Hallingham*, *Coleman* and *Benson* formerly, and (*c*) *Lewis Prevost* in our time.

R. C. He says, we make a great noise with the Notes of our Church, &c. and so long as we hope these may prevail, private Judgment does very well; but when once the Prey is caught, the Business is now done, and away with your private Judgment, p. 8.

C. E. I thought you and your Friends had a greater regard for an Implicit Faith, than to complain of this Charge against you. If not, pray be so kind as to let me know, what *Stapleton* meant by these words (*d*) *We are not to mind how the Church proves, but what it says*; *Tolet* by these, (*e*) *If a Countryman believe his Bishop propounding any Heretical Doctrine concerning the Articles, though it be an Error, he merits by believing*; or the *Rhemists* by these, (*f*) *Such an one, called before the Commissioners, saith enough, and defendeth himself suffi-*

(*a*) *Foxes and Firebrands*, p. 17. *And Bishop* Stillingfleet's *Preface to his Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 13, 14.

(*b*) *The said Preface*, p. 14.

(*c*) *The New Pretenders to Prophecy examined*, p. 491.

(*d*) Non quomodo probet, sed quid dicat Ecclesia, animadvertendum nobis est. *Princip.* Fidei Doctr. *l.* 4. *c.* 9.

(*e*) Si rusticus circa articulos credat suo Episcopo proponenti aliquod dogma hæreticum, meretur in credendo, licet sit error. *De Instruct. Sacerd.* l. 4. c. 3.

(*f*) *On* S. Luke 12. 11.

ciently,

ciently, when he answereth, that he is a Catholick Man,—— and that his Church can give them a reason of all the things, which they demand of him; or *Gabriel Biel* by these, (*a*) *This is implicit Faith, whereby a faithful Man believes whatsoever the Church believes: it is most profitable to the Faithful: for whilst it is in the Heart, it preserves from all heretical Pravity.* For which Doctrine he cites *Ocham* also, and *Gerson*. Or again, how are we to understand that most remarkable Saying of Cardinal *Cusanus* to the same purpose. (*b*) *How firm is the Building of the Church, inasmuch as no one can be deceived even by a wicked Bishop? If thou shalt say, Lord, I have obeyed this Prelate, this will be sufficient for thy Salvation; for thou, by the Obedience thou payest to the Prelate, whom the Church tolerates, canst not be deceived, even though he should command otherwise than he ought: for the Church presumes concerning that Sentence, to which if thou obeyest, great will be thy Reward. Wherefore an Obedience without Reason is a compleat and most perfect Obedience, that is to say, when Obedience is paid without the Inquiry of Reason, after the manner as a Beast obeys it's Master.* But I forbear to heap up Instances in so plain a Case, and which you yourself plead for, *Part* 1. *p.* 449. This is the known Doctrine of your Party, and

(*g*) Hæc est fides implicita, quâ fidelis credit quicquid Ecclesia credit: Utilissima est fideli: Nam si fuerit in corde, defendit ab omni hæreticâ pravitate. *In Sentent.* l. 3. Dist. 25. art. 1. coroll. 4.

(*b*) Quam firma est ædificatio Ecclesiæ, quia nemo decipi potest etiam per malum præsidentem. Si dixeris, Domine obedivi tibi in præposito, hoc tibi sufficiet ad salutem; tu enim per obedientiam quam facis præposito, quem Ecclesia tolerat, decipi nequis, etiamsi præceperit alia quam debuit: præsumit enim Ecclesia de illâ sententiâ, cui si tu obedieris, magna erit merces tua. Obedientia igitur irrationalis est consummata obedientia & perfectissima, scilicet quando obeditur sine inquisitione rationis, sicut jumentum obedit Domino suo. *Excit.* l. 2. 6.

they are sure to recommend it to practice, amongst such as they have got under their Power. And whether this be an Encouragement to *Private Judgment*, or a crying *away with it*, I may leave even to yourself to determine, the Case is so very plain.

R. C. You cannot deny, but you allow the use of Reason, or Private Judgment, in getting People over to believe the Scripture; But when once the Prey is caught, the Business is done, and away with your Private Judgment. Ibid.

C. E. I beg your pardon, Sir, for as we recommend *Private Judgment, in getting People over to believe the Scripture*: So do we no less afterwards, in order to a right Understanding of it, least otherwise they should embrace Error instead of Truth, and the Dictates of some false Teacher instead of the Word of God. Which is a very different Procedure, from the Implicit Faith recommended amongst you.

R. C. Were the Apostles only to make a right use of their Reason in finding out Christ, and then away with their Private Judgment?

C. E. Do you suppose the Case parallel betwixt our Blessed Saviour, and a grosly corrupt and erroneous part of his Disciples? Or are we any where required in Scripture, to have the same regard to the Church of *Rome*, whatsoever Errors it should fall into, either in Doctrine or Practice, as to our Lord himself, who could not err? Till you can make this out, though impossible, we must inevitably insist upon the Privilege of using our *Private Judgment*, that we may not unawares mistake our way.

R. C. The Greek *Church, and several others, in the Eastern part of the World, were irreconcileable Enemies to Transubstantiation, as Mr.* Claude *has proved at large.* Thus speaks the Vindicator. And yet

these,

these, *when requested*, Anno 1671, 1672. *to declare their Sense, did so, and unanimously professed Transubstantiation*, &c. *Ibid.*

C. E. The Question, as to the *Greek*, and other Oriental Churches, is not, whether they own Transubstantiation now, but how long they have done it. I grant, the Synod at *Jerusalem*, under *Dositheus* Anno 1672. is for it. But then Mr. *Claude* tells us how the way was prepared for this Change of theirs, (*a*) That *they were won by Money, several Pretences were made use of by the Emissaries, to introduce themselves into their Houses, they prevailed on their Bishops, not making them publickly change their Religion, but leaving them in the same Communion wherein they found them, to the end that they might likewise endeavour the Establishment of the* Roman *Faith.* The like Account we have also from the late learned (*b*) Dr. *Smith*, a diligent and curious Enquirer into Matters of Fact. Who informs us, that the two Metropolitans of *Sophia* and *Achrida*, and *Cyril* of *Birrhæa*, were sent from *Rome*, on purpose to procure the Deposition of *Cyrillus Lucaris*, in order to the bringing their Designs about. But give me leave to tell you, this is a Method of propagating Religion, that was utterly unknown to our Saviour and his Apostles, and which will never be for the Credit of whatsoever Church that makes use of it.

R. C. The Vindicator *had been told* [that is, the *Restater* had owned] *that two Cities in* France, Amiens *and St.* Jean de Angeli, *both pretend to have St.* John Baptist's *Head, but the Truth is, they have Heads of Saints called* John. *Admit this*, says he, *They are not both his Head, whose Name they bear, and so the Worshippers of one of them must needs*

(*a*) *Cath. Doctr. of the Eucharist*, l. 2. c. 5.
(*b*) Collectanea de *Cyrillo Lucario.*

be guilty of Idolatry. Good Sir, why one of them? If they give any Creature Divine Worship, both are guilty of Idolatry. If they do not, how can either of them be Idolaters? p. 9.

C. E. Will you stand to what you say here, that *Giving any Creature Divine Worship is Idolatry.* What then becomes of the *Latria* which the Pontifical declares to be due to the (*a*) Cross. What becomes of your (*b*) *Crucem tuam adoramus Domine,* We adore thy Cross, O Lord? What becomes of your frequent Prayers to the Blessed Virgin, and other Saints, not only to pray for you, which you can never justify, but moreover (*c*) *to Defend you against your Enemies,* (*d*) *to Deliver you from Evils and Dangers,* (*e*) *to Loose the Guilt of your polluted Lips, and the Bonds of your Crimes, to make you Meek and Chaste, to Receive you in the Hour of Death, and to Place you in the Heavenly Seats?* If this be not giving Divine Worship to a Creature, it will be very hard to tell what is. And then, how will you distinguish it from Idolatry? Or if you give any other solemn religious Worship to an Image, or a Relick, he must be more skilful than I pretend to be, that can excuse it from being a palpable Violation of the Second Commandment; and by what Name you will call such a Violation I know not. At the best see what Answer you can return to those words of the *Vindicator?* (*f*) *You have no more proof of their being the Heads of two* Johns, *than of one and the same* John. *And yet supposing they were the Heads of two* Johns, *how should I know these were both*

(*a*) Rubr. de Benedict. nov. Crucis. (*b*) Fer. vi. in Parasceuem. (*c*) Brev. in Fest. B. Mar. (*d*) Brev. in Fest. omn Storum Offic. parv. B. Mar. & Pontif. in Imag. B. M. (*e*) Brev. in Nativ. S. Jo. Bapt. In Fest. omn. Storum, & Offic. B. Mar. in Sabbat. (*f*) *Case truly stated,* p. 91.

Saints,

Saints, and so in your Opinion to be Worshipped? Here may be a mischievous Mistake, for ought appears to the contrary, like that of the supposed (a) Saints in the Catacumbs, who in reality were no Saints at all, some of them probably no Christians.

R. C. It was no excess of Charity in him, to ascribe, as he does so often, whatever our Divines say in favour of the Church's Authority (which the Scripture attests) to a Sacrilegious Desire of concealing the Corruptions of it. And the Truth is the same as if a Deist *should tell him, that Christians only magnify the Authority of Scripture, to give some countenance to the absurd Fables of* Sampson *and* Goliah. *This is the* Deist's *Language, not mine,* p. 12.

C. E. Here, after the Example of the *Restater*, you are for putting Objections into the *Deist's* Mouth, as if you were convinced you have no way of defending your own Corruptions, but by trying to expose the Scripture. You say indeed, it is *the* Deist's *Language, not yours.* But if it were not to your liking, how came you to bring it in here so unnecessarily, and to so little purpose? you are for maintaining Miracles to be still wrought in your own Church, even though you want good Evidence for them; and yet can suffer those of *Sampson* and *David* to pass for fabulous, though as fully attested as the word of God can do it. This, I presume, is not done out of an earnest desire to magnify the Scriptures. Nor is it either for the Service of God, or your own Reputation to have done it. But the Truth is, the Scriptures too plainly discover the gross Corruptions of your Church, both as to it's Faith and Worship, and this makes it thought necessary to lessen their Authority upon all occasions. Yet let me tell you, these Holy Writings will

(a) P. *Mabillon* sur le culte de Saints inconnus.

be

be able to stand their ground against all the Attacks of *Deists, Freethinkers, Roman-Catholicks*, or whatsoever sort of Adversaries. And as to your self, since you profess to put a stop to your Career out of compassion *to some Christians of weaker Capacity*, I hope the same Compassion will withhold you from ever beginning the like again.

R. C. He grants the Parts of the New Testament *were not all immediately received after the first Century*; there having been some Dispute about the *Epistles*, &c. *p.* 15.

C. E. Here the *Vindicator* told the *Restater*, that this had been *J. Toland*'s Objection before him, and what Answer it had received. Whereupon you very gravely Remark, That this being *J. Toland*'s Objection, *can no more turn Truth into Falshood, than it can be a disparagement to the Eleventh and Twelfth Verses of the Ninety first* Psalm, *That it was the Objection of one much worse than* Toland. As if the *Vindicator* had said, or at least insinuated, that it could; for which yet you have not the least pretence. But you want to be informed, that *Eusebius speaks there of all the Deuterocanonical Parts of the* New Testament. And does he not speak of the Epistles of S. *James* and S. *Jude*, the Second of S. *Peter*, the Second and Third of S. *John*, besides the *Revelation* which he promises to speak of afterwards. Now, if the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was included amongst S. *Paul*'s Epistles, as I take it to have been, and you cannot prove it was not, you will easily see whether here be all the other Books that can be called Deuterocanonical. And farther, according to your wonted nicety in Criticism, you want likewise to be informed, that τοῖς πολλοῖς *must necessarily signify the* Generality, *as it is there translated*; wherefore, if you please, you may read it

it *by a great many*; which I hope will pass without Offence.

R. C. S. *Jerome* testifies the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and the *Revelation* were doubted of in his time, *p.* 15.

C. E. But he lets you know he could not see any reason why, inasmuch as he himself readily owned them both.

R. C. *Besides that* Tertullian *speaks not of the Books in Question*, Originals *that were extant in the Second Century, might be lost in the Fourth*, p. xvi.

C. E. If out of your great kindness to the Scripture, this be spoken to shew it defective, it lies upon you to prove that any such Books were lost. Till this is done, which can never be done, your Supposition signifies nothing.

R. C. Some even to S. *Jerom*'s time and *Amphilochius*'s rejected it.

C. E. I know not how to come by *Amphilochius*, but I must beg your pardon, if I observe, that your Critical Skill has failed you in translating S. *Jerom*; for he does not say *there were great Numbers, that rejected* the Revelation; but only speaking of the *Greeks* he says, *Non eadem libertate suscipiunt*, they do not receive it with the same freedom as the other parts of Scripture. Which seems to imply, that they received this, together with the other Canonical Books, though *not with the same Freedom.*

R. C. *It is not to be found in the Catalogue of the Council of* Laodicea, nor in that of S. *Cyril*, p. 17.

C. E. Mr. *Richardson*, in his forenamed Answer to *Amyntor*, speaks of this Council in the following manner. (*a*) *The Council of* Laodicea

(*a*) *Canon of the* New Testament *vindicated*, p. 15.

(*Can.*

(Can. 29.) *forbids reading Relations of Private Conventicles, or unconvenient Books in the Church*, viz. *commands, that only the Canonical Books in the Old and New Testament shall be read there*; and then adds (Can. 60.) *These Books of the Old Testament ought to be read*, Genesis, Exodus, &c. *and of the New, these*, the Four Gospels, &c. *reckoning up all those which we count Canonical, only leaving out the* Revelation. *Now the Difficulty is, whether the* Revelation *be left out, as a Book that is not Canonical, in the Judgment of the Council, or the Canonical Book, which is not fit to be publickly read, because not intelligible by the generality. For my part, I must say, that I cannot determine this Question either the one way or the other. For since the Fathers have not expressly declared themselves, they might, for ought we can tell, leave it out as a Book which they thought not Canonical; or they might leave it out as a Canonical Book, which could not be rightly understood by Common Hearers. For that the Church of* England *does not read this Book in the Lessons, for that very reason, but only some small Portions, instead of the Epistles, on some peculiar Festivals. And that also she reads no part at all of the* Canticles *upon the same account; and yet has asserted both the one and the other, to be part of the Canon, in the Thirty Nine Articles.*

CONCLUSION.

THus I have gone through our Answerer, so far as concerns the *Vindicator*; and have shewn how little of what that Author has said is any way weakened, by all that is here brought against him; and that his Arguments are still as firm and convincing as ever. And the Reader may easily observe, that though our Answerer

sets up for a Critick, and makes sad complaint, not only of the *Vindicator*, but Bishop *Cosins*, Dr. *Barrow*, and others of our greatest Writers, it is not for altering the Sense of the Words, but only for not keeping to a strictly literal Translation. Whilst, on the other hand, he allows himself a liberty of rendring (a) *Caput* and *Origo*, not only *Head* and Beginning, but *Center* likewise, against the Sense of all Authors that ever made use of them; only because his Citations, if strictly rendered, would not have been to his purpose. At other times (b) *Primum* an Adverb, must be converted into an Adjective, and made to signify *Chief* instead of *First*. So (c) *Primatus* a Primacy, though it be of order only, is rendred *Supremacy*, (d) *Summa rerum de pascendis ovibus*, is the chief Power of feeding the Sheep, that so it may imply an universal Jurisdiction. *Page* 14, he is not ashamed to trump up that most abominably scandalous Fable of their pretended *Nagg's-head Ordination*. A shameless Fiction, without any manner of Foundation, and against abundant Evidence to the contrary; against our Histories and Records; against the Testimony of the old *Earl* of *Nottingham*, who had been present at the Consecration in *Lambeth*-Chappel, and related the manner and particular Circumstances of it, upon his own certain knowledge; against our constant manner of proceeding in these Cases; and after Forty Years silence on their side, till it was thought, all that were at that Consecration, or any way concerned in it, must needs be dead, and so disabled for contradicting whatsoever Falsities should be forged concerning it; and which has been over and over considered and confuted, and

(a) *Page* 22, 129. (b) *Page* 48 *and* 117. (c) *Page* 23. 48, 96. (d) *Page* 23.

especially by the great Bishop [illegible] in his Answer to Dr. Champney, &c. [illegible]

Mr. L. in the beginning of his Case stated, and put this Question to his Lord; (a) *Pray, My Lord, what is there in the Communion of the Church of England, should make you think your Salvation Hazard? Would there be any hazard of your Soul, if there were no mention of Saints that are dead, in the Publick Offices of the Church: No Pictures, or things of Gold, to be seen there: No Elevation of the Host, which was but of late Years brought into the Church: No Prayers for Souls out of Purgatory: If the Publick Prayers were in the Vulgar Tongue: and if the Sacrament were given in both Kinds?* All this the Restater passed over in a profound silence: He knew the Question was not to be answered, and was therefore so wise as to suppress it: all he could, by not only taking no notice of it, but unruly (a) calling the next following, the *First Paragraph*, which the *Vindicator* complained of, a disingenuous manner of proceeding; and endeavoured to extort a fair and categorical Answer to it. Having repeated Mr. L's words, he adds, (b) *It is certain, they are things which God hath required at our hands; all but the Two last. The rest he has no where enjoined; yet you practise them: Those he has taught, and expressly commanded, and you forbear and forbid them. And our Worship therefore is not the worse, for not concurring with you in those Ceremonies; nor our Souls any way endangered, so long as we are sound in the Faith; and our Offices right in other respects, our Service cannot justly be the less available to Salvation, for being free from unlawful Additions* he should have said, *or Subtractions.* Yet still there is no Answer to be obtained: It was an unlucky Difficulty started, and since it

(a) C. S. p. 5. (b) Case truly stated, p. 3.

cannot

[illegible] otherwise be got over, it was necessary to throw it aside, and say nothing of it. And here must therefore not be unreasonable, as to look for an Answer, where it is not to be had.

The *Vindicator* objects, that as S. *Peter* had no foundation for an Universal Supremacy over the Church of Christ, and in particular, over his Fellow-Apostles; (a) so neither did he claim any such Privilege, even when the fairest occasions durst offer for it. He did not take upon him to nominate *Matthias* to fill the place of *Judas*; nor did he preside in the Council at *Jerusalem*, nor order some other of the Apostles to go to *Samaria*, upon the News of that City having received the Word of God; nor did he undertake by his Authority, to silence the Differences that arose in the Church of *Corinth*; or to punish the Promoters of them, nor to censure S. *Paul* for *withstanding him to his Face*. To all which, there is not a word of answer given, save only, that weak presence of the Apostles assembling at *Jerusalem*, not as a Synod, but as Arbitrators between S. *Paul* and the *Antiochian Jews*. And whereas the *Reviewer* had affirmed, (b) that *The History of the Acts of the Apostles has enough in it, to convince any unprejudiced Person, of S. Peter's Supremacy*; and the *Vindicator* had followed him, through all his Proofs of this nature, and shewn the Insufficiency of them; this Author is so far from making them good, that he takes no notice at all of them. As I have all along had occasion to observe, of great many other instances of an Oscitant Silence in the Body of this Answer to him, and sometimes in the most important Matters of it. Such as those contained, p. 19, 20. p. 41, 42. In the former of which places, our Saviour's Pro-

(a) Q. *Vindicat.* p. 13. (b) Q. *R.* p. 18.

mise to S. Peter, so far as it concerns that Apostle himself, is shewn to relate to his laying the first Foundation of the Church; which is noted also, p. 35. to have ratified. And in the latter is urged, the unreasonableness of supposing such a mighty unconquerable Power left by S. Peter at Rome, and that Antioch, where he first, should have no share at all of it.

Besides, much the greater Part of the Case was stated, is not at all touched; I suppose, because the Answerer would confine himself chiefly to what concerned the supposed Supremacy. However, this shews, that he cannot any way pretend to have answered that Tract, having said nothing at all to the far greater Part of it, having passed over divers considerable Passages in those Parts he has taken into his consideration, and having very unsatisfactorily answered what Places he has fixed upon.

Whence it is easy also to collect, by parity of Reason, how far he has been from confuting those Great Men he has made an attempt upon, as well as the *Vindicator*. The main of their Works he has said nothing to. And where he has fallen upon them, it is a natural conclusion, from the course of his Procedure here, that he has treated them only in the same slight, superficial manner, as he has the *Vindicator*: and by consequence, whoever would undertake to confute them, or any of them, has his work to begin afresh. The famous Bishop *Stillingfleet*, in the Preface to his *Discourse of the Idolatry practiced in the Church of* Rome, complains of Two of his Adversaries, for answering *in the way that Rats answer Books, only by gnawing some of the Leaves*. But certainly, none ever did it more exactly than this Answerer; whose only Business is to carp here and there at some particular Passages, which he

[illegible]

ERRATA.

PAGE 51. Line 12. read Gloc. p. 54. l. 29. r. P [illegible] p. 70. l. [illegible] p. 74. l. upon. r. [illegible] p. 78. l. 20. r. [illegible] p. 90. l. unfortunate. p. 96. l. 7. [illegible] p. 98. l. 32. r. [illegible] p. 96. [illegible]

Books Printed for *George Sawbridge* Bookseller, at the *Golden Ball*, over against the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhill*.

THE Case stated between the Church of *Rome* and the Church of *England*: wherein is shewed, that the Doubt, and the Danger is in the Former, and the Certainty and the Safety in the latter Communion: to which is added, The Case truly stated, wherein the Case stated is fully Vindicated.

Episcopal the only Apostolical Ordination, or, The Case of Ordination fully Consider'd, in relation to these Questions. I. What is a Minister of the Gospel? II. Whence their Authority? III. What are their Qualifications? IV. What Ordination? V. Who are the Regular Ordainers? VI. In what Capacity doth a Bishop Ordain? VII. Whether an uninterrupted Succession be necessary, *&c.* With a Letter from the Reverend *George Hicks*, D. D.

A Panegyrick on the *Maccabees*, by St. *Gregory Nazianzen*: Of unseasonable Diversions, by *Salvian*. A Description of the Manners of the Pagan World. A Consolatory Discourse to the Christians of *Carthage*. Of the Advantage of Patience. By St. *Cyprian*. Done into English by Mr. *Cosher*: together with two Essays on Discourses and Gaming, by the same Hand.

A Critical Essay on the Third Article of the Church of *England*, concerning Christ's Descent into Hell: Wherein several Expositions are Refuted; the Local Descent asserted, and the End and Design of it enquired into.

The true Scripture Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the Eucharist, and the Satisfaction made for us by our Lord Jesus Christ, in three Books. Wherein the Texts in the Old and New Testament relating thereto, and the principal Passages in

Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England, Collected, Examined, Explained and Vindicated from the Errors of Dr. Clarke.

A short and easy Method with the Deists. Wherein the Certainty of the *Christian Religion* is demonstrated by infallible Proof, from Four Rules, which are incompatible to any Imposture that has been or can be. To which is added a Second Part to the *Jews*; shewing that these Rules do oblige them as much as the *Deists* to the Acknowledgement of *Christ*.

The Case of the Regale and Pontificate. In a Conference concerning the Independency of the Church, in the Exercise of her purely Spiritual Authority. With a Supplement in defence of it.

The present State of *Quakerism* in *England*. Wherein is shewed that the greatest part of the *Quakers* are so far converted, as to be convinced.

Five Discourses by the Author of the *Snake in the Grass*, *viz. The Divine Institution of Water Baptism*, and *Right of Episcopacy*; *The Primitive Heresy of the Quakers*; *Reflexions on the Quakers*; *A brief Account of the Socinian Trinity*.

A Sermon preached at *Chester* against Marriages in different Communions. By *Charles Leslie*, Prebendary of the Cathedral of *Connor*. And the same Subject farther prosecuted. By *Henry Dodwell*, M. A.

The Socinian Controversy discuss'd: Wherein the chief of the *Socinian Tracts* (publish'd of late Years) are considered. In Six Dialogues. With Defences, and a Supplement, in answer to *Glanvill's* Book *De Persona*. By *Charles Leslie*.

The Deists Manual: Or a rational Inquiry into the *Christian Religion*. With some Considerations on Mr. *Hobbs*, *Spinola*, *The Oracles of Reason*, &c. By C. *Gildon*, Gent. Publisher of the *Oracles of Reason*. To which is prefixed a Letter, from the Reverend Mr. *Leslie*.

The *Scripture Account* of the *Eternal Rewards* or *Punishments*,

Punishments of all that hear of the *Gospel*. By *Henry Dodwell*, M. A.

Seneca's Morals, By way of Abstract. With a Discourse under the Title of an After-thought.

Fables of Æsop, and other ancient Mythologists. With Morals, and Reflections.

A Guide to Eternity. Written in *Latin* by Cardinal *John Bona*.

Tully's Offices: And *Erasmus's Colloquies*: Both translated into *English*.

[*These Five by Sir* Roger L'Estrange.]

Essays of *Signeur de Montaigne*. In Three Volumes. With Marginal Notes and Quotations, and an Account of the Author's Life and Character. Made *English* by *Charles Cotton* Esquire. The Fourth Edition.

Essays on several Moral Subjects, in Three Parts, by *Jeremy Collier*, M. A. Sixth Edition.

Presagium Medicum, or the prognostick Signs of acute Diseases, Established by ancient Observation, and explained by the best Modern Discoveries.

The Nature, Causes, Symptoms and Cure of a *Gonorrhoea*. By *W. Cockburn*, M. D. F. R. S.

An Account of animal Secretion, the Quantity of Blood in the Humane Body, and the Muscular Motion. By *James Keil*, M. D.

Philosophical Principles of Religion, Natural and Reveal'd: In Two Parts. The first containing the Elements of Natural Philosophy, and the Proofs of Natural Religion, Second Edition: The Second Part containing the Nature of Infinites, together with the Philosophick Principles of Reveal'd Religion. By *George Cheyne*, M.D.F.R.S.

The Maxims of Government, in an Advice to a Republick, shewing, how it ought to govern it self in order to perpetuate its Dominion. In which are also consider'd, the several Interests of all the Princes of *Europe*, with Respect to the Affairs of *Italy*. By Father *Paul*, Councellor of State.